

LA \$8 1918

---

TERMS—\$2.50 a year, in advance.

---

75 cents per copy

---

THE  
**LUTHERAN QUARTERLY**

CONDUCTED BY

J. A. SINGMASTER, D. D.

FREDERICK G. GOTWALD, D. D.

JACOB A. CLUTZ, D. D.

---

VOL. XLVIII—NO. 3.

---

JULY, 1918.

---

Entered at the Gettysburg Post-office as second-class matter.  
GETTYSBURG, PA.

COMPILER PRINT  
1918

## CONTENTS

<p><b>I. The Lord's Supper.</b>—Article X of the Augsburg Confession .....</p> <p style="padding-left: 100px;">By Jeremiah Zimmerman, D.D., LL.D.</p>	305
<p><b>II. An Interpretation of the World War.</b>.....</p> <p style="padding-left: 100px;">By Edwin Heyl Delk.</p>	368
<p><b>III. The First Protestant Systematic Theology</b>.....</p> <p style="padding-left: 100px;">By Professor John Alfred Faulkner.</p>	383
<p><b>IV. The Alleged "Historic Episcopate."</b> .....</p> <p style="padding-left: 100px;">By Professor David H. Bauslin.</p>	395
<p><b>V. Current Theological Thought.</b> .....</p> <p style="padding-left: 100px;">By Professor J. A. Singmaster, D. D.</p>	431
<p><b>VI. Review of Recent Literature.</b> .....</p> <p style="padding-left: 100px;">Wartburg Lesson Helps for Beginners in the Sunday School and Home—He Whom Thou Lovest is Sick—Funeral Sermons by Lutheran Divines—Outlines of Biblical Hermeneutics—Can We Believe in Immortality—The Psychology of Preaching—This Life and the Next—The Teachings of Jesus—Giant Hours with Poet Preachers—The Significance of the Protestant Reformation—The Sources of the Hexateuch—The Religion of Israel—Alpheus W. Wilson; A Prince of Israel—Aram and Israel—The Christian Religion in its Doctrinal Expression—The Good Shepherd—Side-Stepping Saints—The Psalms and Other Sacred Writings—The Man of Power—Bring Him to Me—The Weekly Rally Service—The Christian College—The Mythology of All Races.</p>	441



# THE LUTHERAN QUARTERLY.

JULY 1918.

---

## ARTICLE I.

### THE LORD'S SUPPER.<sup>1</sup>

ARTICLE X OF THE AUGSBURG CONFESSION.

BY JEREMIAH ZIMMERMAN, D.D., LL.D.

"In regard to the Lord's Supper, they teach that the body and blood of Christ are truly present, and are dispensed to the communicants in the Lord's Supper; and they disapprove those who teach otherwise."

In the study and discussion of the doctrine of the Lord's Supper, the logical method of approach must be by way of the Person of Christ. This supreme subject must precede the consideration of the words themselves in the Institution. Who was He who uttered the words? This we must determine and know before we can interpret the words themselves.

Their actual content is wholly dependent upon the character of Him who spoke those startling words, for they would be utterly vain and meaningless if Jesus were no more than one of the Rabbis, and they would have no significance for us.

The Person of Christ is fundamental in the understanding and defense of the doctrine of the Presence of

<sup>1</sup> Lecture on the Holman Foundation delivered at the Theological Seminary, Gettysburg, Pa., April 16, 1918.

the Person of Christ in the Lord's Supper. It includes the supreme question that the Divine Lord and Master asked the Pharisees: "What think ye of the Christ? Whose Son is He?" The correct answer will furnish our defense for the doctrine of the Eucharist. If He were only the son of Mary, then our view would be as utterly impossible as it is to the Socinian or to the unbeliever; but if Christ was the Son of God as He claimed to be, and as His disciples believed Him to be, then our doctrine is not only possible, but it is not unreasonable. However great the mystery may be to us, it is not too great for the Godhead. "Great is the mystery of godliness; He who was manifest in the flesh."

It surpasses human comprehension, but we can believe God and obey by putting ourselves in right mental attitude of faith, love and purpose, just as the unlearned child and unscientific man take the receiver of the telephone and talk to unseen friends, or mount the electric car believing that they shall reach their destination, though they see not nor fully understand the hidden forces that make these things possible. Neither need we see God and understand all His mysterious ways, in order to enjoy the benefits of His divine power and love.

In order to approach aright the contemplation of the actual purport of the Lord's Supper and the real presence of Christ in it, we must go back through the centuries and study the Christ of history in the light of His own age, and get the impression that He made upon His cotemporaries. What did they think of the Christ, and how deep and lasting was the impression that He made upon those who believed in Him? They are His witnesses, and there are not a few. Their attachment was no mere momentary enthusiasm, but stood the test of great personal self-sacrifice through years of devoted service, and they preferred to die rather than deny their Lord and Master.

In fact when He had withdrawn His visible presence, they enjoyed the overmastering conviction that He was ever with them even as He had promised them that He would be. He was their daily peace, their hope, inspira-

tion and power. It was the peace of God which passeth all understanding that guarded their hearts and thoughts in Christ Jesus. They had the realizing sense of His presence, for Jesus meant just what He said in those precious words:—"Abide in me, and I will abide in you." He meant what you may understand by the mystical union with Him, but do not lose sight of Him in your mystical terminology, for Christ spoke plainly that He would always sustain an intimate personal and vital relation with each one of His followers. He would not withdraw from them, but would remain in loving and potent touch with them—inspiring and sustaining them.

The Church would have perished centuries ago because of the persecutions from without, and the unfaithful misguided ones from within. When even the chief heads of the Church became corrupt and lost sight of the spirit and teachings of Christ, then the Lord and Master still kept His abiding presence in the souls of the faithful whom He prepared and inspired to reform the evils in the Church, and to restore God's Word to the people as the one Divine authority for faith and practice.

What made the faithful leaders in the Church from Apostolic times to the days of Luther so bold and invincible was the fact that they realized that the Great Head of the Church—the ever living Christ was living in them, and with this consciousness they were mighty. Listen to that indomitable Apostle Paul who once verily believed that he did God's service by persecuting the Christians, but who by becoming conscious by irresistible proof that Christ was God, was ready to endure all things for His sake—even rejoicing that he should be accounted worthy to suffer in the name of Christ. Hear his confession:—"I have been crucified with Christ; and it is no longer I that live, but Christ liveth in me." That clear and unshaken conviction alone can explain the life of St. Paul. He knew the Christ he trusted, and he could do all things through His strength.

It is impossible to account for the remarkable influence that Christ exerted over the Apostles and the Church

universal, unless we see in Him the God-man. In fact it would be difficult for us to believe some of the things attributed to Jesus, if we did not believe His own claim of oneness with God the Father; but in the light of this truth all is reasonable, and the difficulties vanish as they did with the Apostles.

Read the historical document known as the Acts of the Apostles, and you will see that Christ alone was the Creed of the early Church. Listen to Peter as he declares to the rulers and elders that it was "in the name of Jesus Christ of Nazareth whom ye crucified, whom God raised from the dead" that the Apostles received their power. "And in none other is there salvation: for neither is there any other name under heaven, that is given among men, wherein we must be saved." These are weighty words of no uncertain sound, and they tell plainly what the early Church thought of Christ Jesus.

This subject takes us back to the Christ who once so-journed among men as the transcendent Teacher of all history—for He was pre-eminently a teacher, the Rabbi. He was the unique teacher of His times because He spoke as one having authority and not as the scribes. But He was the unique teacher of all times, because His teaching was inseparable from Himself. You cannot read the Gospels without the Christ. Eliminate the historic Christ from them, and they would be meaningless. This is not true of the great historians, poets, philosophers and even founders of world religions, like Buddah. We can read their works without even thinking of the authors, but that is impossible in the case of the Founder of Christianity. You cannot separate Jesus from the New Testament nor from the faith of the Church through the Christian centuries. As an experiment, take the four Gospels and eliminate the names, and every passage that has any reference whatever to the Christ of history, and what would remain? Not the Gospels. Their rich content and meaning would be gone, for they would no longer contain the good news from God. The precious promises would be gone and every hope canceled; for He who gave



the promises and assurances of hope would be non-existent in the transaction, and all the promises without Him would be as worthless as so many checks that bore no signature of a responsible endorser who could and would pay the amount promised.

When we come to the study of the doctrine of the Lord's Supper, we find that it is pre-eminently true that the words are inseparable from Christ Himself. The entire doctrine is taken up with Him in view, and without Him this ordinance would be non-existent. The very first words of Christ given in all four of the Scriptural accounts, show how He identifies this Sacrament with Himself:—"This is my body ——".

A teacher in a liberal church once said to me, as an apology for his position: "It makes little difference what we think respecting the person of Christ and His divine nature, the all-important matter for us is to study His teachings." This he might truly say of some philosopher and his writings, but with respect to the Gospels everything depends upon the character of the teacher, who and what he was and what he claimed to be—whether he was merely the son of Mary, or whether He was also the Son of God. That is of supreme importance, for the greatest disclosures and most precious promises are worthless unless He who declared them is the Divine Saviour? Of what avail is a note with a "promise to pay" when given by a fraudulent maker?

With reference to the sayings of Christ, everything depends upon who He was. You cannot match the rich treasures embodied in his recorded sayings—for example, in chapters 14 and 15 of St. John's Gospel—but they would become meaningless, if Jesus be not the Christ—the God-man He claimed to be.

Read and ponder that final message given His disciples from the slopes of Olivet:—"All authority hath been given unto Me in heaven and on earth. Go ye therefore and make disciples of all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit; teaching them to observe all things whatsoever

I commanded you. And lo I am with you always, even unto the end of the world." In this startling commission He spoke with the Divine consciousness of His oneness with God the Father, and though His visible presence was withdrawn He inspired the disciples with power, by the consciousness of His indwelling presence; for instead of being cast down and mourning, St. Luke tells us that they worshipped Him and returned to Jerusalem with great joy; and were continually in the temple, blessing God. We must account for this strange spiritual condition, so wholly unexpected, for it would have been absolutely impossible without the abiding presence and sustaining power of Christ.

In the early Christian Church, the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper was regarded of supreme importance when they assembled together for worship. They realized their need of the real presence of Christ, and in the Lord's Supper they had the assurance of His presence given in His own words that He spoke when He instituted the Supper. When they heard the same words repeated that once fell from His lips, they carried with them all the significance that they bore when originally uttered by their Lord and Master; and hence the supreme emphasis given to this ordinance by the Church universal.

Nowhere else was the doctrine of the brotherhood of man exemplified as here in the fellowship of all classes of Christians, from the higher classes as well as from the lowest ranks of society. The masters and slaves met together in common places of worship—in private homes of those who could provide suitable rooms, in the days when the Church was in the home. The doors were closed against no believer, and however humble, all were admitted to the Lord's Table. Christ had died for all irrespective of their social standing; for all were one in Christ Jesus and were partakers together at the Lord's Supper that was instituted for all who received Christ for their Lord and Master.

The early and general observance of the Lord's Supper is undeniable proof of great evidential value as to the fact

of Christ's resurrection, and the irresistible impression that it made upon His cotemporaries and their immediate followers. Never would this Supper have been repeated after Christ's ignominious death, and become the most sacred ordinance in the worship of the primitive Church, had He not risen from the dead and appeared alive again unto His disciples. It was the power of the personal and ever-living Christ in His resurrection from the dead that made the Lord's Supper a necessity in that Sacrament where they held a real communion with Him, and for which there could be no substitute.

In the Christian Church the altar or table of the Lord was of the highest significance, for it was inseparable from the Lord Himself; and hence it was the most conspicuous object in the Church, occupying the central or chief place in the sanctuary.

The reason for this distinction was due to the fact that on that altar or table of the Lord were consecrated the sacred elements, the bread and wine—of which Jesus had said:—"Take eat; this is my body, etc." They recognized the presence of the Person of Christ in that Holy Sacrament, and hence its prominence and the supreme importance attached to it. Amid the bitter persecutions of the first Christian centuries when the devotion of the worshipper meant death, they sought out at times the subterranean chapel in the Catacombs among the recesses for their dead in Christ, and there on the sacred altar were consecrated the elements for the celebration of the Lord's Supper; for that holy fellowship was too precious to them to be omitted. It was indeed a nourishment for their souls as they recognized the real Presence of the body of Christ in that Sacrament.

The same was true when the bloody persecutions were waged against the Huguenots of France, when at times the worshippers were hunted down like wild beasts, and were unable to assemble in their public sanctuaries, for that would have exposed them to death. But they longed to commune with Christ in the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, and hence at the great risk of life they met in

the dead of night at a designated secret place known as the "Black Swamp," and there they met their Saviour in the Holy Communion. The terrible wars of religion could not quench the deep longings of soul that Christ alone could satisfy.

The same was true in the north of Europe, when the Covenanters of Scotland were denied the precious and God-given, inalienable rights of religious liberty, to worship according to the dictates of their own conscience. They could commune with Christ in prayer in secret in their own homes, at their work and along the street or highway, but they realized the deep wants of the soul that had often been satisfied at the Holy Communion, and hence they assembled at night on the heath, in an unfrequented place, and there together in God's unbounded sanctuary and the starry canopy of heaven above them, and the consciousness of Christ's presence, they met at the Lord's Supper and together received the Person of Christ—His Body and His Blood. They realized His real presence and that they had received His substantial grace that was sufficient for them; and they returned home strengthened and encouraged, abiding in Christ and He in them. The Holy Eucharist meant something to them and they could not dispense with it.

Our New England forefathers suffered great hardships during the severe winters for they lacked the modern comforts, and their churches had no methods of warming them; and yet the people assembled together and in their plain and uncomfortable sanctuaries to celebrate the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper. So bitter cold was it at times, as Judge Sewall left us the record, that the broken bread for the communicants was frozen and rattled in the paten like morsels of ice. It meant something to them, and the sacrifice that they made was the proof of their conscientious devotion.

Inasmuch as the various denominations acknowledge the authoritative character of the same scriptural accounts, it is evident that it has become a question of interpretation. It is no less evident that the particular



views arising from interpreting the divine record will depend largely upon our mental bias and the manner of approach. If we are thoroughly prepossessed with our particular views, however we may have come by them, then the result is a foregone conclusion. The point of view that men take of questions depends very much upon which side they are on, for this is a psychological fact seen in the history of politics as well as in religion. The rank and file follow the leaders and take it for granted that they are on the right side, for prejudice and the personal equation become the substitute for critical investigation. The members of the Roman Catholic Church do not think for a moment that they have been in error in any of their fundamental doctrines and practices, and that the Protestants are nearer the truth in faith and practice. The converse is also true, and hence the conservative ways that endure.

Much depends upon the antecedents of the people, and the vast majority, if not all, are the product of their antecedents. Hence when some controversialists have entered the arena, they found it so difficult to get the other men's point of view and to deal fairly with him.

There have been much bitterness and misrepresentation among controversialists at times, who losing their judicial temperament also lost sight of the critical standards that should always guide us in the search for truth. Some men who have differed from us on even important questions, may be vastly the superior of some who have agreed with us and we must still love them in soul and show it in conduct. This is Christ's requirement:

"This I command you that ye love one another, even as I have loved you."

Whilst all cannot think alike, all may love alike, and hence Christ's command. In years of world-wide travel I saw mothers of every intellectual, social and religious condition imaginable—their differences were great and irreconcilable, but they all resemble one another in this one supreme fact they *all loved alike*. Each one cared for and loved her child devoutly. God is love, and each

mother bore the image of God manifested in the Flesh, for we all are the offspring of God. When we give ourselves up to hate and cease to love, then we cease to be Christian.

Hence there should be no intolerant speech nor hate in theological discussion, however much men may differ in their opinions. I pray and long for the early coming of the day when the Roman Catholic and Protestant clergy can talk as men and brethren in Christ, about the undeniable facts of history that brought about the Reformation; and freely acknowledging the lamentable mistakes that once prevailed in the Church, desire to find a common ground of belief where we can labor together for God and humanity. I can and have talked as a brother man to a Jewish Rabbi respecting that memorable Passover in Jerusalem when Jesus suffered crucifixion. We talked like men concerning the chief actors and the responsibility of the High Priest in that miscarriage of justice when the Innocent One was nailed to the cross. Surely we must be able to meet Christian men also, and in the spirit of love discuss historic events that emphasized abuses as well as the Christ and His truth.

The old veterans of the Civil War who fought at Gettysburg, come together on that famous battlefield, with all the once bitter differences buried, and they meet in love and hearty good fellowship—vying in loyal devotion to country. Why cannot priests and ministers do as well? All regret the mistakes of the past. No Jew would name his boy Judas Iscariot and no Roman Catholic would baptize his boy John Tetzal, just as no American would name his son Benedict Arnold.

When I reflect upon some of the shocking examples of intolerance and selfishness on the part of men claiming to be followers of Christ, I am reminded of Constantine the Great who after vainly endeavoring to enable the old Novatian to see his unchristian intolerance as the Emperor saw it, said complacently to the self-possessed pretender: "Take a ladder, Acesius, and climb to heaven by yourself." There have been some self-deluded fanatics like

the ascetics, and a few selfish ones that remain, who would even want to take the ladder with them when they make the ascent to heaven and leave others to perish.

It is difficult for a man who has studied and thought upon a subject, to approach its discussion with a wholly unbiased mind, for he must have received some impressions and have some convictions upon the subject. Doubtless Dr. Thorburn in his *Mythical Interpretation of Christ* realized this difficulty, for he betrays his own bias when he informs us that in order to approach this doctrine of the Eucharist, we must "first of all disembarass ourselves of sacramental theories of a metaphysical nature, whether they be those of the Middle Ages or of the Sixteenth Century or later." But this is a begging of the question. In the study of the Lord's Supper, it is all important to approach it with a judicial mental attitude and in the spirit of humble devotion, recognizing our human limitations and the transcendent divine mystery involved in the doctrine of the presence of the Person of Christ, which surpasses our comprehension and hence is beyond the power of any man to explain.

This is no reason, however, for indifference or neglect to devote the most serious contemplation in the endeavor to approach as nearly as possible to a reasonable understanding and interpretation of the fundamental concept and practical design of the Lord's Supper. Such a reverent view should beget in us the Spirit of Christ as we seek His presence and guidance into this the very Holy of Holies in the Christian Religion.

Surely the student with the consciousness of Christ's presence, should steady his soul and safeguard his thoughts and speech so that in this Holy Communion where the whole Church of Christ is united as one in Christ, in redemption and in love, there may be no spirit of hate and no ambition to denounce nor misrepresent those who may differ from us; but we should seek to be controlled by the Holy Spirit's guidance who has promised to take the things of Christ and show them unto us, and who is to lead us into all the truth. It is not our pre-

judice, not our will that we would have prevail, but alone the Will of Christ and His interpretation we would humbly seek.

Whilst the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper has occupied the central and fundamental place in the worship of the Christian Church, it is no extravagant speech to declare that it has been the storm center of theological controversy. This has been due to the variations of belief as to the content or meaning of the words of the Institution, for scholars have differed greatly as to their interpretation. The words are familiar to everyone and very simple in meaning when taken singly, but when joined together as Jesus used them on that memorable night when He instituted the Holy Eucharist, what meaning did He attach to them and what meaning did he intend that they should convey to His disciples and to the Church Universal?

They are momentous words for us as they have come down through the centuries unchanged, and as they were spoken by our Divine Lord and Master in whom dwelt all the fulness of the Godhead bodily,—for God was in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself when He came to save men from their sins.

The chief discussion has been as to the content and meaning of the words of the Institution: "This is my body," and given in the four accounts of Scripture.

In times past much has been made of that little copula "is," and much learning has been expended to prove its significance or its original absence in the Aramaic language. The conclusions have not been overwhelmingly conclusive; for we are not absolutely sure that our Saviour spoke those words in the Aramaic language, though most probably He did, or that the Apostle Paul received them in that language—a fact to be accounted for before the argument as to the absence of that copula in the Aramaic, can have any final weight. Moreover we believe that undue emphasis has been placed here; for we have not to do with a hypothetical Aramaic expression in which the *locus classicus* does not exist; for the *crux* of



this whole question is found in the Greek language, as given in the Synoptic Gospels and in I Cor. It is the only text that we have; the only one that the Church universal has had, and the so-called Aramaic text with that word "is" wanting does not exist. We have to do with the Greek that contains the *ἐστιν*, corresponding to our English word "is," but the exact meaning of which is the question of dispute. To say that it has no place in Aramaic does not decide the question either way for us.

Christ's words have come directly to us through the Greek language: *τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ σῶμά μου*, and with this we have to do.

What meaning did Christ intend that His words should convey to His disciples and to His Church? That is the question.

The written account of St. Paul is the earliest account that we have of the Lord's Supper, although the Gospels of St. Mark and St. Matthew were written not long after and independently of the Apostle to the Gentiles. But this Epistle is of supreme importance inasmuch as Paul may be said to give us his interpretation of the the Sacrament, in the significant reference to the eucharistic cup in I Cor. 10:16. "The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not a communion of the blood of Christ, the bread which we break? Is it not a communion of the body of Christ?"

In this early explanation he uses forceful language that we cannot escape by saying that it is only figurative, and that the Apostle did not mean what he really wrote. The word *κοινωνία* is a strong word and full of weighty significance in this connection. What did St. Paul mean when he spoke of the cup over which the blessing had been pronounced, as a communion or participation in the blood of Christ?"

Would critical exegesis decide that to an unbiased mind the natural interpretation of the Apostle's words is that he regarded the Eucharist merely as a memorial feast? Then the Apostle, who was a profound thinker, would have plainly said so. Can we conceive of the writer hav-

ing such a simple conception when he wrote: "The bread which we break, is it not a communion (or participation) in the body of Christ?" Nay, the Apostle Paul had a far deeper and richer meaning.

It was not the mere memorial of an absent Christ, but the ever-living Christ present in the Lord's Supper, and an actual union between the communicants and Christ, Whom they received in this blessed Sacrament.

We find a support for our view of the interpretation of St. Paul from an unexpected source. Prof. Dr. Andrews of the Free Church in an article on the Sacraments, reaches this significant conclusion in his thorough study of the subject in the light of Scriptures and history, that the pendulum of criticism against the sacramental view "that has swung too far, and the whole question must be restudied in the light of modern critical investigation." In summing up, he says: "Taking all these facts together, it becomes very doubtful whether any theory that falls short of the Lutheran doctrine, will adequately explain the utterances of St. Paul in reference to the Eucharist. If these arguments are sound, we are forced to admit that as far as exegesis is concerned the sacramentarian interpretation of Paulism has won a decisive victory, and the Symbolical school has been driven off the field. There can be no doubt whatever that baptism and the Eucharist stood for far more in the life of the Apostolic Church than they do in the estimation of the bulk of the members of the Free Churches to-day. The evidence seems to me to be so clear upon this point as to amount almost to demonstrative proof."

"There is a feeling in some quarters that the Free Churches have never yet entered into the full sacramental heritage, and to that extent their spiritual life has been beggared and impoverished. No one can read the biographies of the great mediaeval saints without realizing that there are whole regions of spiritual experience which are a terra incognita to ordinary Free Churchmen. The difference is not so much due to mysticism as to the place which sacrament holds in their devotional life. May we

not in the fervor of our protest against sacerdotalism, have allowed our iconoclasm to carry us too far and, as a result, have attached too light a value to ordinances which to other Christians have been not merely the medicine of immortality and the antidote against corruption, as Ignatius put it, but the mainstay of the faith of the soul in the life that now is?"

He would advocate a return to the sacramentarian teaching of St. Paul and the other writers of the New Testament—"Is it possible for us to go the length to which Paulism seems to carry us? Can we accept Luther's interpretation of the Eucharist?" I believe he could without difficulty if he understood it correctly and that it does not mean consubstantiation.

So much depends upon our spirit and method of approach, and this will often be determined by our prepossessions or mental bias. One day in speaking on the subject to a layman of more than ordinary intelligence and a worthy elder in a prominent church, I received the reply that Christ made the meaning very plain when he said: "Do this in remembrance of me," and that it was merely a memorial of His suffering and death. The man was perfectly honest in his expression, for that view alone had been impressed upon his mind and he never questioned it.

We know how inadequate such a method is, for the words quoted were not intended to define the actual meaning of the Lord's Supper, for that we must rather seek in Christ's words: "Take eat, this is my body." These are the words that contain the crux, and these have been the storm center in its discussion.

But the words: "Do this in remembrance of me," do not even appear in the first two Gospels, and it may be an interpolation in St. Luke's Gospel, as some able critics of the text believe. At all events we know that it is not contained in the two older Gospels. St. Mark's is the oldest—written between the years 65 and 70, according to Harnack and other authorities. No doubt as early as the year 50, earlier documents existed from notes made of

the words that Jesus had spoken and the impressions made, as well as the circumstances connected with them. How many had written down such memoranda of the words of Jesus we know not, nor the extent of such writings. Luke sought out such literature and availed himself of various transcripts, but the first to give form was that of St. Mark in the Gospel bearing his name. Moffatt states that "the earliest sources upon which they draw, were not composed till about 20 years after the death of Jesus, and no one took down the words of Jesus during His lifetime. Retentiveness of memory, however, and the needs of the Christian halacha in the churches, helped to carry many of the words through the preliminary period of oral tradition. None of them is the direct transcript of an Apostle's memories, even by another hand."

Inasmuch as the Gospel of St. Mark antedated that of St. Matthew by some years, hence for several years at least, if not a longer period, there was but one Gospel in the churches—at first there was but one copy of this Gospel. But naturally it was early copied so that other churches might be supplied with the written Gospel.

Let us go back through the centuries to the primitive Church, when St. Mark was the only Gospel that they had. What impression did they get as to the meaning of the Lord's Supper, when they read from St. Mark's Gospel the words of the Institution, when Jesus blessed and brake the bread, and gave to them and said: "Take ye: this is my body," etc. The words "Do this in remembrance of me," did not appear in the first Gospel read and heard. Not a word in the text to suggest that the Lord's Supper had only a symbolical character and was intended as a memorial and nothing more. The same is true of the Gospel according to St. Matthew, for there is no suggestion of the modern theory that the Holy Eucharist meant only a memorial service to commemorate the absent Lord, who had suffered and died for them.

I am not unmindful that the first Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians, written early in the year 55, contains the



words not found in Mark and Matthew, but that does not detract from the force of my reasoning, for the supply of these manuscripts furnished to the churches was limited because of the peculiar circumstances; and for some years some Churches would have but one manuscript of the Gospels or Epistles of Paul. It was not in the days of printing and there were serious difficulties in the way of having the copies made, for not only were the members poor and generally unlearned, but without necessary influence to overcome prejudice and fear on the part of the specialists engaged in the work of copying manuscripts for the persecuted Christians.

Dr. Alexander MacLaren writing concerning the Lord's Supper, states that Mark 14:22 omits the affecting, "Do this for remembering me," which is presupposed by the very act of instituting the ordinances, since it is nothing if not memorial; and it makes prominent two things—the significance of the elements and the command to partake of them." p. 179. MacLaren is not consistent, for on page 180 he says: "The Lord's Supper is the conclusive answer to the allegation that Christ did not teach the sacrificial character and atoning power of His death." What then did He teach when He said: "This is my blood of the covenant, which is shed for many." But why does MacLaren so thoroughly ignore the meaning of these words, when substituting words that do not appear, in order to explain away the real essence and persuade others as well as himself, that the Lord's Supper is nothing but a memorial? Such exegesis is pure dogmatism in order to support a cherished theory; but is not scientific nor characteristic of the critical temper of the historical student in search for the truth from authoritative sources.

He not only betrays his bias in taking such undue liberty with the words of Scripture to support his views, but he shows his antipathy toward a different view. I was pained when glancing through Vol. III of his Expositions of Holy Scripture, page 285, of John, to read these words, following his Zwinglian ideas concerning the Lord's Sup-

per, for it is nothing more than "purely and simply a rite of remembrance," he says the Zwinglian methods "do look very bald and bare by the side of modern notions and mediaeval notions resuscitated. Well, I had rather have the bareness than I would have it overlaid by coverings under which there is room for abundance of vermin."

This is evidently dogmatism of a pronounced character, but it is not sound exegesis, nor reverent criticism where reverence is naturally expected; for inasmuch as the Lord commands us to reverence His Sanctuary, we are expected to be no less reverent in our behavior respecting the Sacrament of the Altar; for severe chastisements came upon the Corinthian Church because of their irreverent abuses and utter failure to distinguish the distinct and sacred character of the Lord's Supper.

We cannot but deplore such an utter abuse of sound and reverent exegesis on the part of a veteran expositor who has been admired for the spiritual character of his writings. It lacks the judicial balance of a conscientious scholar who will not juggle with words, and even suppress the plain records of the Gospel in order that his own views may prevail—as we shall see. His spirit and undignified, unfair treatment of others, is in striking contrast with the writer of the article on the Eucharist, in the Catholic Encyclopedia; and there is no excuse for such abuse.

We can only deplore his dogmatic expression that "Do this for remembering me, is presupposed by the very act of instituting the ordinance, since it is nothing if not memorial." Such an emptying of the sacrament of all Divine content, is serious; but the offensive word that he injects is next to sacrilege. There is this apology however for him, in the fact that to him this ordinance is nothing but memorial, and he sees not in it the Divine content of the Person of Christ that St. Paul recognized and emphasized when he wrote the warning words: "For he that eateth and drinketh, eateth and drinketh judgeth unto himself, if he discern not the body."

This prejudice warped his judgment, and his sense of

proper expression of the sacred content of the Holy Sacrament of the Lord's Supper; but it evidently has little meaning and solemnity for him. Neither does he appear to be very sensitive respecting his representations or misrepresentations of the teaching of Jesus as to the meaning of the sacrament, for he states that "Jesus Christ said that the Lord's Supper was to be observed 'in remembrance of me.' That was his explanation of its purpose, and I for one am content to take as the expounder of the laws of the feast, the feast's own Founder." Doubtless he intended this statement for wit, and I have no contention on this point, except to affirm that it contains neither reason nor the truth. He knew very well when he wrote these words that the language of Jesus the Founder, as recorded in the Gospels of St. Mark and St. Matthew, do not contain these words, and that possibly their appearance in St. Luke is an interpolation. Hence why does he base his argument and draw his infallible conclusion from a hypothetical statement that he would inject into the first two Synoptic Gospels, and without due qualification, he would put into the mouth of Jesus as well as his own interpretation thereof? This shows the power of prejudice when an expositor of God's Word will deliberately eliminate or suppress, by ignoring the very words of Jesus in two of the Gospels, and substituting others in order to support his theory, and mislead his readers.

If the purport of the Lord's Supper is only a memorial of Christ's death, then why not substitute in its stead a more positive and significant symbol,—one which is not only the peculiar property of the Gospel, but which is inseparable from Christ? I mean the cross that Jesus bore for us and on which He died to save us. No one could ever be mistaken when he contemplates the cross. The power of association is irresistible here, and to look upon the cross is to look into the face of the suffering Christ who died for us on the cross. We cannot say the same of mere bread and wine; nor either one in itself nor together are so indissolubly associated with our Lord. They

were common articles of daily food and drink for all classes of people in Palestine irrespective of their religious faith and life. But the cross had a symbolical meaning that could neither be confused nor overlooked. It was the symbol of God's love and man's redemption. No symbol in all the world is so sacred or so rich in meaning; for it stands for Christ and Him alone on Calvary. It is by this sign that we conquer.

In the Museum at Ueno, Tokio, I saw those interesting symbols that were devised by the government with a view of discovering the Japanese Christians so as to stamp out Christianity in Japan in the beginning of the 17th century when the converts were estimated at one million. The persecutors knowing the sacredness of the cross, determined that the Christians should either trample upon it or expose themselves to death by refusal. Hence at the great thoroughfares, all had to pass through narrow passages on the ground of which were placed plates of copper on which were in relief, representations of Christ's sufferings on the cross. The pagan had no scruples for that symbol, but the Christian convert refused to trample upon that figure that meant his Saviour; and thus the spies detected many Christians among the Japanese, who accordingly paid the death penalty for their faith, during the two centuries that this infamous edict remained in force. The historic meaning of the cross was unmistakable.

Inasmuch as the words: "This do in remembrance of me," are not contained in St. Mark, St. Matthew, and probably not originally in St. Luke, but alone in I Cor., therefore some would claim for St. Paul an entirely independent source,—because the passage in question is found in no other record. But no one who has seriously studied the subject could be influenced by those who claim that St. Paul originated this sacrament, and that the Jewish Christians received it from him. Such a conclusion is incredible, for the ordinance was observed among the Christians of Jerusalem before the Apostle became a convert to Christianity. It is also inconceivable that the

primitive Church could ever have taken the initiative in introducing this Supper of the Lord as a substitute that was to supersede the Jewish Passover. There is only one way of accounting for its immediate and dominant central place in the worship of the early Church, and that was the universal faith that our Lord Jesus Himself had instituted it with Divine authority and with the assurance of His presence in that sacrament. Neither the disciples nor St. Paul, without the sanction and guidance of Christ who instituted it, could ever have given to it the overmastering influence that it has exerted through the Christian centuries.

While St. Paul gives us the first *written account* of the Lord's Supper, we must not overestimate the significance of this fact and conclude that the first knowledge of its existence is traceable to him, for as Plummer states, "this does not for a moment imply that he was the first to teach Christians to 'do this in remembrance of me.'" This passage implies that repeated celebrations were already a firmly established practice."

The authority of St. Paul was quite inadequate to this immense result. Nothing less than the authority of Christ would have sufficed to produce it. Paul himself tells us whence he received the information. The source of it was Christ—not necessarily direct, but through the immediate agency of the disciples who had heard the words from the lips of Jesus. Whilst we cannot tell with absolute certainty just how he received the information, this seems the most reasonable, for there was no necessity for special, supernatural revelation when actual witnesses were available. It is the unimpeachable fact that we have to do with the unquestioned testimony of the writer who makes his appeal to that memorable night when Christ instituted the Supper; and none could deny the fact.

Professor Percy Gardner maintains that St. Paul is the author of the Lord's Supper; and to this McGiffert replies in the Apostolic Age as follows: "It is inconceivable that the Jewish wing of the Church would have taken

it up had it originated with him. Its general prevalence at an early day in all parts of the Church, can be accounted for only on the assumption that it was pre-Pauline. There can be little doubt that Mark and Matthew, so far as they agree, represent the primitive tradition as to Christ's words. We must go back to Mark for the primitive form."

"There can be no doubt that Jesus ate the last Supper with His disciples, as recorded in all three of the Synoptic Gospels, and that He said of the bread which He broke and gave to His companions: 'This is my body,' and of the wine which He gave them to drink, 'This is my blood of the covenant which is shed for many,' and that He did it with a reference to His approaching death. As the bread was broken and the wine poured out, so must His body be broken and His blood shed, but not in vain." p. 69. "The Lord's Supper was eaten by the primitive disciples of Jerusalem, and there can be no doubt that it was everywhere celebrated in the Churches of the Apostolic Age. The only description of it which we have in the literature of the period, is found in Paul's First Epistle to the Corinthians." p. 537.

Whilst this Epistle was written anterior to any of the Gospels, it does not necessarily follow that there were not in existence partially written accounts of the Sayings of Jesus; and St. Mark may have been able to make use of such a document that was earlier by some years than the First Epistle to the Corinthians. At all events the Gospels were entirely independent of the Apostle St. Paul. On the other hand he naturally obtained his information from certain ones of the disciples, notably St. Peter—with whom he spent 15 days in Jerusalem, and that knowledge came to the disciple direct from the Lord; and hence as the sole intermediary, St. Paul could truthfully say that his communication respecting the Lord's Supper came from the Lord and was not the speculations nor fabrications of men. He had every reason to be convinced as to the Divine source, though not directly communicated to him, but through the disciples, and the au-

thenticity was unquestioned. Hence he wrote in such positive language—with a feeling of absolute certainty.

This early account of the observance of the Lord's Supper in the city of Corinth, shows how well known this sacrament must have been at that time.

Already abuses had sprung up, and hence St. Paul writes his Epistle to correct the evils and to set before them the facts connected with the divine origin and character of the Lord's Supper, so unique and sacred that it must not be confounded with the ordinary feasts of the pagans about them; for this is indeed the Lord's Supper and Christ's Presence is in this Holy Eucharist.

St. Paul doubtless obtained this information concerning the Lord's Supper, directly from the Apostles, although he gives us the earliest and oldest *written* account. The reason that the Gospels were not written earlier were two-fold. In the first place there was no occasion inasmuch as the living witnesses were the teachers and preachers of Christ and His Word. They had seen and heard Him, and people would have greatly preferred to receive their knowledge directly from these witnesses, who testified what they personally knew and heard than to have read it from a manuscript. Just as we to-day prefer to hear men tell us what they themselves saw in some strange country, rather than read the book written by one who obtained his knowledge from secondary sources. We know what feelings are awakened when we find an old volume published in the days of the author who describes what he actually saw among the nations of our country 175 years ago.

When I Cor. was written, the Gospels were not known, and the small assemblies that made up the early Churches were composed for the most part, of people in humble circumstances, unlearned and not influential. The Apostles visited them and told them of Jesus and what He said. Of course the only Sacred Scriptures that they had were the Old Testament—in rolls, and hence they were entirely dependent upon the voice of the preachers who at first were the Apostles themselves. The churches were



limited, and there seemed no immediate occasion for writing the Gospels as a sacred canon for the remote future, because there was a general expectation that Christ would soon come again, and hence the Gospels were not written earlier; and St. Paul may never have seen a copy of any of them. In fact it may be truly said that the Synoptics were crystalizations of the Gospel that had been preached in the early Churches. The words had become familiar by being repeated over and over again, by the Apostles and by those who had heard them from the lips of eye-witnesses or from special written sources.

If we hold to the Lutheran view of this doctrine then the view of our Church must harmonize with the teachings of the Holy Scriptures, for they are the fundamental rule for our faith and practice. This is the norm by which our doctrine is to be tested, and by this alone it can stand. We are justified in making our appeal at all times to Christ's own words. We have no other standard, and these will continue to be the standard for all time, for Christ declared: "Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my words shall not pass away." Hence the foundation for our doctrine is secure. We take the identical words of the Institution, and allow them to stand for each communicant as he comes to meet his Lord and Saviour at the Holy Communion. We do not add nor subtract from these momentous words spoken by the Son of God who is really present in that Supper. He fully understood what He said, and He meant all He said; and had He intended less, then He would have spoken accordingly. Hence we dare not subtract anything from His words nor add thereto by way of substitution in order not to discern the body of Christ in the Lord's Supper. That might lessen the Divine Mystery but in the same degree it would lessen the actual content and precious meaning as a special and substantial means of grace.

Such an unwarranted method involves too great a sacrifice and we do not escape mystery; and the intellectual difficulties have not been removed. Far better we believe, to repeat to the communicant the very words spoken

by Christ Himself, unchanged and undiluted by any rationalizing method to get rid of the power and presence of Christ, the God-man, who ever remains the same undivided Divine and human Saviour, boundless in power, omnipresent, and hence able to be present also in the Holy Sacrament; but *how* we are not called upon to explain, but merely in faith and love to obey Him who says to the communicant: "Take, eat, this is my body." Christ thoroughly understands them—they are no empty words, but they contain and convey to the faithful communicant a precious and special blessing, for it is no less than Christ Himself. This full measure of grace is what our people realize. The Holy Communion in accordance with Christ's words means much to them, and with proper preparation they come expecting much, and they are not disappointed. No matter how much Christ's words contain He will not disappoint us; He is inexhaustible, and He can and will keep His word. There is no occasion for anxiety or doubt here, He will abundantly meet His obligation when we come in faith and loving devotion; for whilst He is invisible to us, He sees us and knows our needs, and He who died for us on the cross and rose again for our salvation, He will not withhold Himself from us in His Holy Supper.

He is not afar off, seated somewhere in heaven; for He is not localized nor restricted, but He is here also on earth among humanity—those whom God loves as His own children and for whom Christ died. Yea this Christ who said: "Lo I am with you alway," why stumble at the doctrine of His real presence in the Eucharist, and insist upon excluding Him here at His own altar? Why not find fault with St. Paul for using the strong language he does concerning our "communion or participation with the body of Christ" in the Lord's Supper? The difficulties are only increased, instead of lessened by taking a lower view than that held by our Church, for there remains too much to be explained away, if we would make it only a memorial of Christ's sufferings and death. Is it consistent to reason thus and discount entirely the

words that Jesus attached to these elements? Surely Christ did not utter meaningless words. On that solemn occasion, on the eve of Calvary He fully realized the solemnity of the Institution, and He knew what language meant, and surely He did not speak empty words. Are we justified in saying so by declaring that they are purely figurative and contain no special content of the Person of Christ, but that He is absent and only present through the Holy Spirit? Why deprive Christ's own words of their inestimable value? for the communicant who realizes his sins and need of the Saviour, wants to meet that same Christ in this sacrament.

"Jesus Christ is the same yesterday and to-day, yea and forever." The burden of proof must lie with those who would eliminate the undivided oneness of Christ's presence from this sacrament by seeking to explain away the content of Christ's own words.

The Lutheran Church acknowledges the profound mystery involved, but her position is safe in accepting Christ's words as spoken; and she does not feel warranted in *explaining them away* even though we may not be able thoroughly to explain them. In obedience to His gracious words we come to the Lord's Supper expecting to find the presence of Christ in it and to receive much from Him; and we are not disappointed. We greatly prefer to accept the historic Christ who came from God the Father for man's salvation, and to listen to the words that He uttered when He instituted the Eucharist. We do not seek a different Christ, but He alone who announced Himself as a God-man; and whatever He said that would we believe and do in this objective teaching. We know but one Christ, the true *Immanuel*—God with us, in Christ Jesus. That was the Jesus of the primitive Church, whom they knew, believed and worshipped as the Christ of God, for He alone was the Christ of the Gospel, and His presence we would discern in the Lord's Supper by faith in His Word.

Have not Protestant churches at times made a mistake in putting the supreme emphasis on the words of the

preacher, and losing sight entirely of profound meditation and communion with God in the services of the Church? This sad fact is unmistakable in the common language of to-day when inviting someone to their Church, for instead of saying: "We would like to have you come and *worship* with us," they say: "You ought to come and hear our *preacher*." Such significant invitations tell their own story; but why not come to *worship* God, and *meditate* upon *His Word*? The soul needs to commune with Him whom we have to do, and this should be the chief end of our coming to the sanctuary. This is especially true when we come to the Lord's Supper, for then we would commune with Him alone, and meditate upon the very words He spoke when He instituted this sacred ordinance. Does it not appear most unseemly for frail and sinful man, utterly to ignore these words of Christ that are absolutely inseparable from the Lord's Supper, and necessary to make it the Lord's Supper, and instead of Christ's own words, substitute what we in our human conceit presume that He ought to have said. How can we justify ourselves in telling the people to accept *our* words, and not Christ's if they would know the truth concerning the significance of the Holy Communion? Nay Christ's words shall never pass away, and he who would come to Christ in the Eucharist and commune with Him, must ponder only the words of Christ in the Institution: "Take, eat; this is my body." Let the communicant take these words alone and meditate upon them, for there can be no others. These are Christ's words, and He who is the Truth made no mistake when He uttered them. They have come down through the Churches unchanged for nearly nineteen centuries, and they will remain until the end of time. Meditate upon them alone when you come to the Lord's Supper and you will find Christ there as your Lord and Saviour.

We acknowledge the profound and impenetrable mystery involved in the words of Christ spoken on that memorable occasion; and whilst we cannot make them plain and present an infallible solution as to their phi-

losophy and how these things can be, we nevertheless cling to the words of Christ without revision and without denial—for His words cannot pass away, and we dare not take from them nor add thereto, just because they surpass our comprehension and power to explain them. We dare not separate the humanity from the Divinity in Christ in the Presence of His Person in the Lord's Supper; for we can know only the one indivisible Christ who continues the same forevermore.

The fact that it is an inexplicable mystery must not disturb our faith, for we cannot fathom the mind and the ways of the Almighty in accommodating Himself to the needs of humanity, and we must not insist upon *limiting Him* by our human limitations. In fact we are in the realm of mystery as soon as we enter the domain of religion; for we have to do with the unseen and the Infinite One. Nevertheless the things with which we have to do are not unreasonable nor impossible with Him, for all things are possible with the Infinite God. The most real things are unseen.

By the terms flesh and blood or body as used in the Scriptures, we understand them to mean human nature or humanity. According to Dean Goulburn when we engage in the sacramental act by taking the consecrated elements, the bread and wine, they are "not only the sign and symbol of the Body and Blood of Christ, but also the instrument of conveying, in some highly mysterious way, far above out of our reach, an actual participation in His crucified Human Nature, according to St. Paul, I Cor. 10:16. In the well known words he becomes his own interpreter of the words of the Institution that he records in the following chapter, and we would abide by his explanation."

As the learned Hooker writes: "The bread and cup are His body and blood, because they are causes instrumental upon the receipt whereof the *participation* of His body and blood ensueth. Our participation of Christ in this sacrament dependeth on the co-operation of His omnipresent power which maketh it His body and blood.

Let it therefore be sufficient for me, presenting myself at the Lord's Table to know what there I receive from Him, without searching or inquiring of the manner how Christ performeth His promise."

The Lutheran Church is perfectly safe in her position in holding unequivocally to the words of the Institution without trying to explain away their content, and thereby eliminating from them the real Presence of the Person of Christ and making them rather symbolical than sacramental. To state that Christ is really present through the Holy Spirit is too indefinite and unsatisfactory to be accepted as a substitute for the real objective presence of Christ Himself. Not a divided and partial Christ, but the same Christ of history, who became incarnate when the Logos became Flesh and dwelt among men. We need the same Christ.

We too, like the ancient Greeks, would see Jesus. There is power in the personal Christ and nothing else can satisfy the human soul. God must manifest Himself through a person that men could see and hear. "Show us the Father, and it sufficeth us, expresses the universal need." Abstract teachings concerning God's love would not satisfy. It would not be comprehensible by the human mind. Love must express itself indeed through a person. It must be seen in service, in sacrifice for man. Christ foresaw all this when He said: "And if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all men unto myself." In that matchless love that led Jesus to the cross, actions spoke louder than words, and no power is comparable with it; for the cross showed God's love and man's redemption. When Jesus wept at the tomb of Lazarus, they said "Behold how He loved him," but on the cross we behold the full measure of that boundless love.

It is this same Christ, the God-man who is present in the Lord's Supper, that every human soul needs. Every tempted and tried child of humanity struggling to do the will of God in his service for mankind, but ever conscious of sin and his many shortcomings,—always earnestly praying and striving to be better, finds precious consola-

tion and assurance in meeting the Christ in the Lord's Supper, who once dwelt in a human form with a human nature (tempted in all points like as we are, but without sin), and who can fully sympathize with us. We come with confidence as we look into the face of the same Christ who said to the repentant sinner: "Thy sins be forgiven thee. Go and sin no more."

He sympathizes with us in our infirmities, and we realize his fellowship and forgiveness as we commune with Him. We believe and receive as He says: "Take, eat, this is my body, given to you." I am confident that, like the Greeks who came to the disciples with the earnest request that they might be able to see the Jesus of whom they had heard so much—we also would see Jesus. We all have had this longing, and my supreme purpose is to make the ever-living Christ as real to you as He was to the Greeks. This is possible, for "Jesus Christ is the same yesterday and to-day, yea and forever." He says to us "Abide in Me and I will abide in you." It was the consciousness of His abiding presence, that made the phenomenal lives of the Apostles as they went forth like immortals whose lives were hid with Christ in God, and with the inspiration and vision of Christian imperialism—to win the world for Christ. He kept His promise that He would abide in them. He made their heroism and success possible by His divine presence that inspired and sustained them. He did not abandon them when thrust into prison for preaching in His name, but He visited them and brought them forth with the heroic challenge, that only the consciousness and His abiding presence, could have made possible: "We must obey God rather than man." Make this Christ very real, for you must feel the power of His presence if you would preach His word. We must see Jesus when we declare to the people: *We are* the ambassadors therefore on behalf of Christ, as though God were entreating by us: we beseech you on behalf of Christ, be ye reconciled to God." We should seriously ponder these profound words that we may fathom their meaning, and adjust ourselves to this relation as minis-



ters of Christ. Before we can measure up to this intellectual and spiritual standard of thinking and being, we must realize Christ's presence, as did the Apostle when he declared "it is not I but Christ that liveth in me."

We must recognize with St. Paul, the power of the personal Christ; and "ever looking unto Jesus the author and perfecter of our faith." Time and distance are no barriers for the human mind. It is the mind that is the man; and the mind sees more than eyes can see. We can see with the mind and love our loved ones 1000 miles away, as clearly and as dearly as we can when they are invisible to our eyes in an adjoining room. We can think back several thousand years and see some famous character of history, just as he appeared to his cotemporaries. We need not see the Christ with our eyes.

There would be no practical advantage in seeing Jesus in the flesh; and the great apostle did not desire any longer such a view; whilst the disciples were never so mighty and triumphant in faith as when they saw Him no more with their eyes. The two disciples on the way to Emmaus failed to recognize Jesus, even though they saw His face and heard His words. Though He stood before Mary on that first Easter morn, she failed to know Him; but stood disconsolate at the tomb weeping, though He said to her, "Woman why weepest thou?" Not until He called her by name, did she recognize the risen Lord.

To go back through the centuries to Palestine when Jesus sojourned among men, may seem a long distance to some, and the way at times may appear indistinct and hazy, but we need not traverse that journey and period on foot; but with the historic document of the gospels in hand or in mind,—and in a moment we go back in thought and visualize the scenes and vitalize the leading characters. Whilst we have no portraits of Jesus, we have the moral and spiritual portraits in the Gospel; and the cotemporary portraits of rulers may aid us in our efforts after realistic and vivid impressions.

When I was addressing an association of clergymen on the subject of the Lord's Supper, a minister said to me, "I

see that you get much more out of the Lord's Supper than we do, and that it means much more to you." I replied, "True, because we believe that there is much more in the Lord's Supper than you see. We take the words of Christ at their face value, as they stand in the divine record; and as the Apostle Paul taught—we discern the Lord's body in this holy sacrament, whilst you eliminate the Person of Christ, the essence that we receive;—hence we receive so much more than you receive, for it is an entirely different Communion. With us it is the real communion with the body of Christ: "The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not a communion of the blood of Christ? The bread which we break, is it not a communion of the body of Christ?" But my friend recognized in it only a memorial of the absent Person of Christ. There is a vast difference, hence, between our conceptions of what the Lord's Supper is and what it means to the communicant—of the one who sees in it only a memorial service.

No wonder that the Eucharist is so precious to us; for it means so much to us, and we receive so much. We may receive much or little from this sacrament, according to our conception of its content. If we fail to discern the Lord's body in this Holy Communion and make it merely a memorial to commemorate the Christ who once sojourned on earth, then we may receive what we expected from it, and nothing more, since we have failed to recognize the real intrinsic content. It is because the Person of Christ is indivisible in His deity and humanity, that His real presence includes His divine and human natures. Hence in the Lord's Supper, we enter the very Holy of Holies of the Christian religion, for here we meet the Christ as nowhere else. The elements are not mere signs, for the Christ Himself is here, and the communion in the language of St. Paul, is the actual participation of the body and blood of Christ as our spiritual food; for Christ is not absent though unseen, but present as the symbols are, and as truly communicates Himself to us according to His Will.

We must distinguish between the *presence of the spiritual or glorified body of Christ*, and the mere spiritual presence of the body of Christ.

Dr. Jacobs states in this connection, "When, however, they teach that the presence is that of the spiritual body of Christ, they do not mean to affirm that this is not the same body as that in which He suffered and died; but by the spiritual body is meant that Same Body in its glorified state, sharing not only in the new properties that belong to the glorified bodies of believers after the resurrection, but in the full and complete exercise of those infinite properties that belong to human nature in both body and soul from its union with a divine nature. This presence, they teach, is dependent entirely upon the word and institution of Christ, and in no way upon the faith of the communicant."

"No scriptural authority can be found for any sacramental presence except in the sacramental action itself. Nor are the bread and wine, and the Body and Blood of Christ received by the mouth in the same way; the former being received naturally and subjected to all the processes undergone by other food; but the latter supernaturally and in a way not occurring except in this sacrament. There is a sacramental which is not a spiritual, and there is a spiritual which is not a sacramental, feeding upon Christ."

Dr. Valentine in his valuable work on Christian Theology says: "Our logically consistent dogmatists have represented the supernatural presence in the Eucharist as the presence of Christ in His whole theanthropic Person, in Self-Presence and Self-communication to His people. Luther maintained the real presence of Christ Himself." He quotes Martensen: "He is present wholly and entirely in His Supper, where He in an especial manner, wills to be. The sacramental communion is not a partaking of the corporeal nature of Christ apart from His corporeity." "We believe that the whole and undivided Christ gives Himself as the ailment of the new man in the Lord's Supper." "In His gifts, He gives Himself.

Take, eat, drink, this is I; in this I give you what is the *innermost power of life in Myself*." Sartorius says: "For bread and wine truly communicate and appropriate to us, the Christ who was sacrificed for us." II, 347. Dr. Valentine quotes Hollaz in his explanation of the "difference between the eating by faith and the sacramental manducation": "The former always contributes to our salvation; the latter sometimes may be done to our condemnation; the former apprehends the whole Christ with all His benefits; the latter apprehends only the body of Christ in and under the bread." Dr. Valentine adds: "Does not this concession show the urgency for the oral or corporeal reception to be at least a misplaced emphasis in ideating the realities of the sacrament? The strenuous insistence on it as the chief essential reality is hardly justified, in face of the admitted fact that there is no real necessity for it *per se*; that in itself, *without the spiritual reception at the same time*, it is inefficacious and damaging. The vital need in the sacramental doctrine is to lay the controlling stress on the spiritual reception of Christ through faith. *No grace* is received through either word or sacrament except through this. And he who thus receives Christ realizes in Him *all* grace. This recognition of the truth that Christ in His whole Divine-human Person is present in the Supper where He specially wills to be, thus suggests the possibility that there may have been no real necessity for the various *expedients to explain and assure* a literal oral reception."

"These methods of support or elucidation, which have been (or some of them) increasingly abandoned among our most prominent confessional theologians, have been more successful in continuing the controversy than settling it. But when the Eucharistic Presence is clearly recognized as that of the glorified Christ Himself, it is at once divested of the incongruities and troubles connected with efforts to think it under the materialistic and limiting terms of flesh and blood," and the equally limiting acts of 'oral' eating and drinking. By such recognition both the presence and 'reception' are at once lifted above

the naturalistic modes, and transferred to the generic and acknowledged reality of the mystery of the exalted Redeemer's omnipresence and bestowal of the gifts of His grace." II, 350.

"Though we cannot explain this Eucharistic Presence of the undivided Person of the Divine and human nature in Christ, it is conceivable and not impossible for the Omnipresent Saviour to will and grant to the faithful communicant a 'special' sacramental presence. Through His omnipresence wherever He wills, the bread and wine are made the appointed media to His people of a special real communion with Himself, not as an absent but present Christ and Saviour. He fills these elements with His pervasive presence, with His glorified human nature as well as with the divine, making them the vehicles for His self-importation in the fulness of His atoning self-sacrifice. This truth becomes *explanatory and defining* for the mode of communication and reception in the Supper." p. 351.

"The terms body and blood stand for the humanity in which Christ gave Himself to death for sin; and since His exaltation, He is present in the mode of existence which His Deity gives or can give to His whole Person: Lo, I am with you always."

"It is of the body and blood of Christ as He possesses them since His glorification, and not of them in naturalistic sense or condition, that the Lutheran doctrine makes affirmation. It distinctly repudiates everything like a presence or reception after a gross, natural or physical manner.

"Though it has sometimes been called 'corporeal,' this word is used, not at all with respect to the mode of it, but only adjectively to include the human or bodily reality in the presence. The mode is marked as 'sacramental,' 'supernatural,' 'incomprehensible,' and 'spiritual.' Hence impanation, consubstantiation and subpanation are all repudiated as descriptive of the manner of it. The 'oral reception' or 'oral manducation' has not been made by our Church as a whole, a necessary part of its sacra-

mental doctrine, appearing only in the Form of Concord.

The Presence in the Supper is of the glorified and exalted Christ Himself, in the indivisible unity of His Divine human Person," and "the glorified Christ can be received only by spiritual comprehension and appropriation. Oral manducation is inapplicable to acceptance of His Divine nature, and His human nature does not exist apart, to be separately given or received." p. 357.

He holds that according to the Lutheran doctrine the Lord's Supper is "in its essential content and significance, a divinely-instituted Sacrament for perpetual use in His Church, which while constituting a memorial of His redemptive suffering, is made also through a *real, special definitive Presence*, under His generic omnipresence,—a means by which He gives Himself to believers as the ever-living Saviour, in the fulness of His provided grace and saving power. This believing sacramental reception becomes a real communion, fellowship, not only with Christ, but of believers with one another, as forming the Church, the spiritual body of Christ." Dr. Valentine, ii, 359.

Dr. Krauth in his monumental work on "the Conservative Reformation," furnishes abundant testimony to the fact that the Confessions and great Lutheran theologians without a dissenting voice repudiate the monstrous doctrine of Consubstantiation, the name and the thing, in whole and in everyone of its parts. In the Wittenberg Concord, 1536, prepared and signed by Luther and the other great leaders in the Church, it is distinctly stated: "We deny the doctrine of transubstantiation, as we do also deny the doctrine of a Capernaitish eating of the body of Christ, which after so many protestations on our part, is maliciously imputed to us; the manducation is not a thing of the senses or of reason, but supernatural, mysterious and incomprehensible. The Presence of Christ in the Supper, is not of a physical nature nor earthly nor Capernaitish, and yet it is most true." As Bishop of Waterland states concerning the doctrine held by the Lu-

theran Church respecting the Lord's Supper: "What they admit and abide by, it is a sacramental union, *not a corporeal presence.*"

In reference to the charge of ubiquity, the Form of Concord is very explicit: "Our Church rejects and condemns the error that the human nature of Christ is locally expanded in all places of heaven and earth, or has become an infinite essence." "If we speak of geometric locality and space, the humanity of Christ is not everywhere." "In its proper sense it can be said with truth, Christ is on earth or in His Supper only according to the Divine nature, to wit: in the sense that the humanity of Christ by its own nature cannot be expected in one place, but has the majesty (of copresence) only from divinity." "When the word corporeal is used of the mode of presence, and is equivalent to local, we affirm that the body of Christ is in the heaven and not on earth."

Dr. Krauth further states: that "Of a local presence of the body of Christ, in, with or under the bread, there never was any controversy between Lutherans and Calvinists; that *local* presence we expressly reject and condemn in all our writings. But a local absence does not prevent a sacramental presence, which is dependent on the communication of the divine majesty."

Gerhard, that profound thinker and theologian of the Lutheran Church is very clear and unequivocal in his statements respecting our belief, and in repudiation of the errors attributed to us respecting the Lord's Supper. Surely our Confessors and theologians must have known what they believed and taught; and they have a right to explain the content of their words and language, as well as to deny and refute the erroneous views that have been attributed to them whether through malice-aforethought or misunderstanding of their actual belief. Necessity has compelled this to be done so often and thoroughly that it might reasonably seem that there would be no further excuse for any further misunderstanding or misrepresentation as to our real views.

Dr. Hodge in his lectures, says of the Lord's Supper:



"We now enter the innermost Most Holy Place of the Christian's Temple. We approach the sacred altar on which lies quivering before our eyes the bleeding heart of Christ. We come to the most private and personal meeting place between our Lord and His beloved. It is the central ordinance in the whole circle of church life, around which all the other ministries of the church revolve." 390.

"The divinely-prepared historic root of the Lord's Supper was the Passover. The pascal lamb was a type of Christ."

"Christ as an objective fact is as really present and active in the sacrament as the bread and wine, or the minister or our fellow-communicants by our side. We know nothing as to the ultimate union of our souls and bodies, yet we no less are certain of the fact. So we need not speculate how it is that Christ, the whole God-man, body, soul and divinity, is present in the sacrament; but we are absolutely certain of the fact that He has promised it." "What is present in the sacrament is not literal flesh and blood to be eaten and drunk, but the whole divine-human person of our Lord, etc."

"We maintain our unshaken faith, not in abstract material flesh and blood, but in the actual objective, effective presence with the believing communicant of the whole divine-human Person of Christ. We are unable and we do not care, to explain the nature of the fact scientifically—Christ is personally and literally and immediately present."

He realized as others did the difficulty to state in a verbal formula the faith of the Church in the content of the doctrine of the Eucharist. He found it necessary to qualify by explanatory words in order that he might express himself in accordance with the consciousness of his own convictions; and others have struggled no less to express adequately, if possible, the truth respecting the profound mystery of Christ's sacramental presence in the Eucharist; but not to explain it away.

Dr. Hodge must have realized his difficulty in reconcil-

ing the doctrine of the Person of Christ with the Calvinistic view of His presence in the Eucharist, for in his efforts to explain and illustrate the absolute and perpetual union of the divine and human natures in Christ, the logical sequence would make the Lutheran doctrine a necessity. He declares that "divinity and humanity act together in the thought, heart and act of Christ who is absolutely one—at the same time unchanged God and pure, unchanged and unmixed man, and whose person in its wholesomeness and fullness is available throughout all space and time to those who trust Him." If this be true, why can He not be present in the Holy Sacrament as we teach, for there is but one Christ, undivided and inseparable, and His humanity must appear with His divinity, since they are united in the Person of Christ?

We acknowledge the mystery as Dr. Hodge does, but we are no more called upon to explain the insoluble than he is; but we believe the fact just as he believes the profound mystery of Christ's Person although it transcends all human comprehension, as he freely admits.

The Lutheran position is consistent and safe inasmuch as we stand by the divine record. We accept it as a historic fact of the Scriptures. So far as the interpretation of the content of the language is concerned, we encounter no greater difficulties on the whole than do those who differ from us, for the supreme fact of the continued-undivided oneness of Christ's Person is involved, and this must be accounted for by those who would have the human nature absent, and localized in heaven. Hence the process is not so simple as it would appear to some who recognize nothing more than a symbolical significance in the Lord's Supper. They assume that they escape all difficulty of interpretation by eliminating the real Christ of history from the Eucharist, under the plea that the words are merely figurative, and that Christ did not or could not have meant what the language would naturally convey. But what basis of evidential certainty have they for such a conclusion? The reasons assigned are generally the result of what they conceive insuperable difficulties in the

way of accepting a more literal interpretation. But they are not through with all the difficulties to be explained by such a summary process. They may escape Scylla, but only to find themselves later contending in Charybdis; for how can they reconcile such a divided Christ with the universal view of the Church respecting His Person?

Dr. Henry J. VanDyke, Sr., in his lectures on the Church, her Ministry and Sacraments, delivered at Princeton Theological Seminary in 1890, refers to Calvin who at times wrote like a Lutheran on the doctrine of the Lord's Supper. But he says that Zwinglianism is essentially *rationalistic* in the evil sense of the words. Its chief effort is to explain away or reduce to a minimum the mystery of the Lord's Supper. We have heard Presbyterian ministers in administering it, eulogizing the absolute simplicity not only of its symbols, but of its whole design and efficacy, comparing it to the monument which recalls the memory of some great man, as though that explained its whole meaning and effect. "We grow weary in our reading on the subject of the reiterated assertion that this or that view is incomprehensible, unreasonable or contrary to common sense; and the more so because the same writers who use such arguments in regard to the Lord's Supper repudiate and denounce them when they are urged by others against the doctrine of the Trinity, the Sovereignty of God, the Incarnation, the Atonement, the resurrection and exaltation of Christ, the vital union of believers with His glorified Person and the wonder-working power of His Holy Spirit—all of which revealed mysteries pervade and are embodied in the transcendent mystery of the Holy Communion."

"The sacrament is founded upon and leads up to His one indivisible Person, which is the reservoir of all divine fulness for our salvation. He is not and cannot be divided. His human nature never had and never can have, any existence separate from His Deity. He was conceived by the Holy Ghost, and was the Son of God from the moment of His conception. His human soul and His human body were separated for three days when the

one descended to Hades and the other lay in the tomb; but neither was parted for a moment from His Divine nature. Moreover since the incarnation, Christ's Divine nature does not exert any saving power nor bestow any gracious gift upon men, except in and through His human nature. The Son of God was from the beginning, the living Word of the Father, the life and light of men; and now since the Word became Flesh it is the *Son of Man* who has power on earth to forgive sins, and is exalted a Prince and a Saviour. By its union with the Divine nature, the humanity of Christ is infinitely exalted. It follows from this that wherever Christ is, there is His human as well as His Divine nature. His human nature is virtually omnipresent, because it is inseparable and forever united to the Divine." 179.

His whole human nature, body and soul, being forever united to His Divine nature, is virtually omnipresent; that is to say—its influence can be exerted and manifested anywhere according to His Divine Will. This real presence of Christ is specially promised and covenanted to us in the Lord's Supper. The consecrated bread and wine are not merely the symbols of His body and blood, but the Divine seals of the covenant whereby Christ and all His benefits are not only represented but applied to us; and therefore their use is the *κοινωνία* the actual participation of Christ's body and blood by every believing communicant. . . . The grace signified is the fulness of the Godhead dwelling bodily in Christ."

"It should be remembered, however, that the body and blood of Christ cannot be separated from Christ Himself, and that no saving benefit can be received from Him unless we are vitally united to His person. His body and blood represent His whole person and offices, His merits, the sacrificial merits of His death and all His benefits, both of grace and glory."

"We reject also the theory of a local presence in, with or under the sacred symbols. Presence as applied in Scripture and in our theology to the anthropic person of

Christ, has nothing to do with locality or limitation of any kind." VanDyke, p. 184.

The controversialists who strive to array Melanchthon on the side of Calvin respecting his views on the sacrament, will find a strong corrective in the conclusion of Dr. Richards in the statement: "Melanchthon never departed from the doctrine of the real presence of Christ in the Eucharist nor from the essentials of the Lutheran teaching on the subject, though later in life he laid more emphasis on the ethical features of the sacraments.

For proof of these affirmations we quote from *Corpus Philippicum*, the preface to which Melanchthon wrote only two months before his death. 'In this communion Christ is truly and substantially present, and is truly administered to those who take the body and blood of Christ.' 'Christ is truly present, and by means of this service He gives His body and blood to him who eats and drinks.' So say also the ancient writers: "What is the Lord's Supper? It is the communication of the body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ as it was instituted in the words of the Gospel, in the taking of which the Son of God is truly and substantially present."

"Melanchthon does not echo Luther's words nor does he speak of a repletive presence or of oral manducation, but without hesitation and without equivocation he affirms the substantial presence of Christ in the Eucharist; and the communication of the body and blood of Christ to the communicant; and in the emphasis which he places upon the sacrament as a sign, a seal, a testimony, an application of the blessing and benefits of Christ, he surpasses Luther, as might be expected of one who declared that the aim of all his theologizing was to make men better."

"Against this teaching by Melanchthon, Luther never raised a word of objection, not even in the Small Confession of 1544 in which he so violently assailed all those who had differed from him in his teachings on the Lord's Supper; but he actually endorsed Melanchthon's teaching on this and on all other subjects, when in 1545 he extolled

Melanchthon's *Loci Communes* above all other books of divinity.

Hence we may say that Luther and Melanchthon were one in their doctrine of the Lord's Supper—not one in phraseology, but one in the essential things, namely, in the real presence of Christ; in the Eucharist; in the communication of the body and blood of Christ to the communicant; and in the necessity of faith for the profitable use of the sacrament." p. 391.

"But by and by the ultra Lutherans emphasized the accidents rather than the essentials of Luther's teaching, and more and more laid stress on oral manducation, on the sacramental union, on the *in, cum, sub pane et vino*, that is, on the dogmatic and extra-biblical content, and on the conception that there can be no substantial reception of Christ apart from the sacraments, since the heavenly gift is imparted only *in, with and under* the sacraments."

"The followers of Melanchthon insisted more and more on the union of the living Christ, the God-man with the believer. Such presence of Christ was not less real than that contended for by the rigid adherents of Luther. It was less dogmatic but more religious and ethical." The two views and the two tendencies are absolutely irreconcilable with each other. In the extreme form in which they appeared in the 7th decade of the 16th century, they do not represent the Lutheran doctrine of the Lord's Supper, as the same had been set forth in the official witness of the Lutheran Church. 393.

Calvin in his Institutes, Vol. II, p. 534, quoting St. Paul: "The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ? The bread which we break, is it not the communion of the body of Christ?" Nor is there any cause to object, that it is a figurative expression, by which the signified is given to the sign. Yet this being admitted, we may justly infer the substance; for unless anyone would call God a deceiver, he can never presume to affirm that He sets before us an empty sign. Therefore if by the breaking of the bread, the Lord truly

represents the participation of His body, it ought not to be doubted that he truly presents and communicates it. I say therefore, that in the mystery of the Supper, under the symbols of bread and wine, Christ is truly exhibited to us, even His body and blood."

"Christ exerts His power wherever He pleases in heaven and earth—just as if He were corporeally present; in short, feeds them with His own body, of which He gives them a participation by the influence of His spirit. This is the way in which the body and blood of Christ are exhibited to us in the sacrament." (542). That is, they are not there as Christ said they were.

VanDyke says: "It is trifling to set aside these Scriptural statements as mere figures of speech. The figures fall short of the profound reality which they illustrate. It is no less trifling to resolve the mystery of this personal union with Christ into the indwelling of His spirit in the souls of believers." 180. He quotes from Bannerman on the Church of Christ—"It seems impossible, with any show of reason, to assert that the *discernment* spoken of in I Cor. XI:27-29 is the mere power of interpreting the signs as representatives of Christ's death, or that the guilt incurred is nothing more than the danger of abusing certain outward symbols. Those expressions evidently point to a spiritual and awful sin, not of misusing and profaning *Christ actually present in them.*" II, 138.

Even Calvin at times expresses himself in the language of a Lutheran as when he remarks on I Cor. 11:24-26. "For He (Christ) does not simply present to us the benefits of His death and resurrection; but the very body in which He suffered and rose again."

We have a right to be judged in the light of the statements of our own theologians who have spoken *ex-cathedra* for us; and we have a right to protest against writers, who instead of consulting the recognized standards of the Lutheran Church, persist in misrepresenting us by deliberately quoting what our enemies have said about us. A conscientious scholar always examines the original sources as far as possible, in order to get au-



thoritative testimony. We want to know the absolute truth respecting a man's belief; and hence we go to the man himself. If I want to know what the doctrine of transubstantiation is, as held by the Catholic Church, then I must go to the recognized authority, and hence I quoted from their able writer in the Catholic Encyclopedia. We do not want a caricature by perverting the facts, nor by substituting the views of an unsympathetic critic. It is because this principle of justice and fairness has been so commonly and persistently abused that the Lutheran Church has been greatly misunderstood concerning the doctrine of the Lord's Supper. I regret to find that able and broadminded scholar, Dr. Briggs, repeating the old charge that Consubstantiation is the Lutheran doctrine of the Lord's Supper,—an error that our Church has always repudiated from the beginning. With the passing of Dr. Briggs, who cannot atone for the wrong by acknowledging and correcting it, there seems little hope of our escape from far less fairminded and able men, who prefer to misrepresent rather to take us at our word as so often publicly declared. Men may know the Lutheran position and understand us if they will. Dr. Gerhard spoke with the authority of the Church when he wrote the clear forcible words: "To meet the calumnies of opponents, we would remark that we neither believe in Impantation nor Consubstantiation, nor in any physical or local presence whatsoever. Nor do we believe in that consubstantiative presence which some define to be inclusive of one substance in another. Far from us be that figment. The heavenly thing and the earthly thing, in the Holy Supper, in the physical and natural sense, are not present with one another." It was a disappointment when reading the article on the Eucharist in the Catholic Encyclopedia, to find that the writer had fallen into the same pit of careless error with its many Protestant brethren. On page 580 he twice repeats the obnoxious word, and quotes with approval the attitude of Calvin in this respect, for he states: "The Calvinists therefore, are perfectly right when they reject the

Lutheran doctrine of Consubstantiation as a fiction, with no foundation in the Scripture." That is, "the coexistence of the substance of the bread with the true body of Christ" as the writer defines Consubstantiation. The truth is the Lutheran Church not only repudiates his imputation of that oft rejected dogma, Consubstantiation, but we as heartily repudiate his definition of the error assigned to us.

We agree with the writer of that excellent article on the Eucharist in the Catholic Encyclopedia, when he says, "The Church's Magna Charta are the words of the Institution, "This is my body—this is my blood," although we might qualify the explanatory clause connected with it, viz, "whose literal meaning she has uninterruptedly adhered to from the earliest times." However, what the writer says is worthy of serious consideration: It is but natural and justifiable to expect that, when four different narrators in different countries and at different times relate the words of Institution to different circles of readers, the occurrence of an unusual figure of speech, as for instance, that bread is a sign of Christ's Body, would somewhere or other, betray itself either in the difference of word-setting, or in the unequivocal expression of the meaning really intended, or at least in the addition of some such remark as: 'He spoke, however, of the sign of His Body.' But nowhere do we discover the slightest ground for a figurative interpretation," 574, V. "Neither from the nature of the case nor in common parlance is bread an apt or possible symbol of the human body. Were one to say of a piece of bread: "This is Napoleon," he would not be using a figure, but uttering nonsense. Belief in the Real Presence necessarily presupposes belief in the true divinity of Christ.

"There is but one means of rendering a symbol, improperly so called, clear and intelligible, namely, by conventionally settling beforehand what it is to signify." He is not so secure of his position when he states that "Christ intended to institute the Eucharist as a most holy sacrament, to be solemnly celebrated in the Church to the end

of time. But the content and the constituent parts of a sacrament had to be stated with such clearness of terminology as to exclude categorically every error in liturgy and worship."

A fair and generous interpretation of the divergent opinions that have prevailed among the most conscientious scholars in the various branches of the Christian Church, would hardly warrant such a positive statement as being delivered with *ex-cathedra* authority. With the spirit of all judicial fairness, we must admit that we cannot be so absolutely certain, and that the language is so categorically certain that there cannot be an honest difference of opinion; for the words do admit of more than one interpretation, and that accounts largely for the unfortunate divisions in bitter controversy, for here we all ought to be united in love to Christ as well as in love to one another. We cannot but deplore the gross error into which Zwingli fell when he utterly repudiated the doctrine of the Real Presence and made the sacrament of none effect, but merely a memorial of Christ's death, and without the living Christ in that supper.

The writer in the Catholic Encyclopedia accepts the words of the Institution and John 6 as well, in all their literalism; and the doctrine of transubstantiation was the logical sequence for the Church in time. Under "The totality of the Real Presence" he refers to the Council of Trent which defined the Real Presence "to be such as to include with Christ's Body and Blood His soul and divinity as well. Hence Christ is present in the sacrament with His Flesh and Blood, Body and Soul, Humanity and Divinity." 578.

He holds that when Christ said of the bread: "This is my body," the bread became through the utterance of those words, the body of Christ; consequently on the completion of the sentence, the substance of the bread was no longer present, but the body of Christ under the outward appearance of bread. Hence the bread must have become the Body of Christ, i. e., the former must have been converted into the latter."

The "Totality of Presence means that Christ in His en-

tirety is present in the whole of the Host and each smallest part thereof, as the spiritual soul is present in the human body. The difficulty reaches its climax when we consider that there is no question here of the divinity of Christ, but of His body which with its head, trunk and members has assumed a mode of existence spiritual and independent of space; a mode of existence indeed, concerning which neither experience nor any system of philosophy can have the least inkling. That the idea of conversion of corporeal matter into spirit can be entertained, is clear from the material substance of the Eucharist Body itself. The body of the Christ is not invisible or impalpable to us because it occupies the fourth dimension, but it transcends and is wholly independent of space. Such a mode of existence, it is clear, does not come within the scope of physics and mechanics, but belongs to a higher order, even as does the Resurrection from the sealed tomb, the passing in and out through closed doors, the Transfiguration of the future glorified risen Body."

He holds that "the Body given to the Apostles was the selfsame Body that was crucified on Good Friday, and the Chalice drunk by them, the selfsame Blood that was shed on the Cross for our sins." "The total conversion of the substance of bread is expressed clearly in the words of Institution, "This is my body." Transubstantiation means that "the entire substance of the bread and the entire substance of the wine are converted respectively into the Body and Blood of Christ in such a way that only the appearances of bread and wine remain."

Concerning the doctrine of transubstantiation we agree with Gore: "Apart from the degree of authority which it has obtained in the West and to a certain extent in the East, there is truly on the grounds of antiquity or Scripture or reason, nothing to be said for it. And we cannot admit the weight of an authority which fails in these supports." 123.

This materialistic theory of the Eucharist grew in the Church until in the 11th century it became established as the fundamental doctrine in the celebration of the Lord's

Supper. Berengar who had ventured to dissent from the teaching of the hierarchy was compelled to recant what he had proclaimed, and to declare "that the bread and wine which are placed upon the altar, are after consecration not only a sacrament but the true body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, and sensibly (sensualiter), not only in sacrament but in reality, are handled by the hands of priests and broke and bruised by the teeth of the faithful."

Plummer quotes Evans where he states that "the bread and wine after their benediction or consecration, are not indeed changed in their nature but become in their use and in their effects, the very body and blood of Christ. *How* the sacramental bread becomes in its use and effects the body of Christ, is a thing that passes all understanding: the manner is a mystery." Plummer adds: "The meaning is in harmony with the context. In this connection the symbol is never a mere symbol, but a means of real union; and in the Lord's Supper the symbol is very significant. It is a means of union with Christ in that character which is indicated by the broken body and shed blood: that is, union with the crucified Redeemer. Christ's death was a sacrifice; and to proclaim His death and appropriate His body and blood offered to that sacrifice, is to realize the sacrifice and to appropriate its effects. The sacrificial idea appears in Heb. 13:10. But the altar on which Christ offered His sacrifice was the cross; and the altar on which we offer is Christ Himself." With regard to the Eucharistic controversy we wish, with Hooker, that men would more give themselves to meditate with silence what we have by the sacrament, and less to dispute of the manner how."

Of the much discussed words *τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ σῶμά μου* he says: "All carnal ideas are excluded by the fact that the Institution took place before the Passion. Our Lord's human body was present, and His blood was not yet shed. What is certain is that those who rightly receive the consecrated bread and wine in the Eucharist, receive spirit-

ually the body and blood of Christ. How this takes place is beyond our comprehension."

On I. Cor. 10:16 Plummer says: "There is only one body, the Body of Christ, the Body of His Church of which each Christian is a member. This is the meaning of 'This is My Body.'"

Jeremy Taylor, on the Real Presence wrote: "In the explication of this question it is much insisted upon that it be enquired whether, we say we believe Christ's body to be really in the sacrament, we mean that body, that flesh that was born of the Virgin Mary, that was crucified, dead and buried. In answer, I know none else that He had or hath; there is but one body of Christ natural and glorified; but he that says that body is glorified that was crucified, says it is the same body but not after the same manner; and so it is in the sacrament; we eat and drink the body and blood of Christ that was broken and poured forth; for there is no other body, no other blood of Christ; but though it is the same which we eat and drink, yet it is in another manner." Ignatius wrote: "The false teachers (who denied the reality of our Lord's manhood) abstain from eucharist and prayer, because they do not acknowledge that the Eucharist is the flesh of our Saviour Jesus Christ, which suffered for our sins, which by His goodness the Father raised up." "Breaking one bread, which is the medicine of immortality, the antidote that we should not die, but live in Christ Jesus forever."

"The gift of the Eucharist is precisely that gift of the flesh or body and blood of Christ—the spiritual principle and life of Christ's manhood, inseparable from His whole living self—the meaning of which, apart from all question of how or when we receive it."

Gore contends that the gift and presence are spiritual, but by the word 'spiritual' it expresses not what is unreal, but what is profoundly real. In whatever sense then we approach and receive the body and blood of Christ in the Eucharist as spiritually present, it is certain that they are in the deepest sense real and really

present." 125. "The more the modern physicist investigates the ultimate nature of matter, the more he breaks down all the supposed barriers between matter and spirit." "The risen body of Christ was spiritual in a different sense not because it was less than before material, but because in it matter was wholly and finally subjugated to spirit and not to the exigencies of physical life. Matter no longer restricted Him or hindered. It had become the pure and transparent vehicle of spiritual purpose." 127. This is illustrated by the appearance and disappearances at will after His resurrection: He became visible and invisible according to His divine purpose. He appeared to His disciples when the doors were closed, "yet to exhibit to them the attributes even of the mortal body, by eating with them. Henceforth, during the 40 days, He never lived with them in the life of earth, but was manifested from time to time as His spiritual purpose required. From a physical point of view, spiritualization of matter as is involved in this conception of a spiritual body is becoming perhaps, more and more conceivable; less out of analogy with our ultimate conceptions of matter. But the important point to notice is that the spirituality of the risen body of Christ, lies not so much in any physical qualities as in the fact that His material presence is absolutely controlled by His spiritual will. His manifestations were manifestations to special persons—those whose faith He willed to rekindle—under special forms for special purposes.

"And if all *subjection* to conditions of space was over for the body of the resurrection, even more certainly was it over for the glorified body (if any distinction is to be drawn), the body in which He through His whole person has become 'quickenings spirit,' even His flesh and blood are 'spirit and life.' As to what the 'body of glory' is, silence is our best wisdom. We feel sure indeed that He retains 'all things appertaining to the perfection of man's nature'; and with St. John we believe that He not only has come but also is to come again in the flesh. But it is not in the flesh and blood of our present conceptions,



which 'cannot inherit the kingdom of God'; nor have we any faculties to conceive the glory of which even our material nature in Him is susceptible. It is enough for us to know that in the perfection of our nature, but in glory inconceivable, He still exists; and it is out of this glory that He feeds us with the flesh and blood which are spirit and life." 130.

"What materially fundamentally means are becoming increasingly vague." 131. "Though Christ condescends to use material means, the sacramental elements, yet He is never subject to them." "No physical organs can appropriate the accompanying spiritual gift" in the Eucharist. As Mozley states: "To suppose that a man's natural mouth and teeth can eat a spiritual thing, would be a simple confusion of ideas." He quotes the celebrated phrase of Augustine: "Believe and thou hast eaten." And yet we must not separate and make faith so entirely independent of the act of actual participation in the Eucharist, for the words of the Institution are "Take, eat, this is my body," and the Apostle severely condemns those at Corinth who fell into abuses.

I believe there are positive indications of an unmistakable character that the tendency of Protestant Churches in Great Britain, is toward a doctrine most in harmony with the Lutheran, and that when once they understand our doctrine they will find it altogether acceptable. Unfortunately we have been so misunderstood, that we are often grossly misrepresented. With all our explanations and denials, they insist upon charging us with holding the doctrine of Consubstantiation, which some would understand as only a refined degree of transubstantiation—hardly differing in kind but only in degree.

But the future appears brighter, as my reading and intercourse with able representatives of the various denominations in Great Britain lead me to conclude. A learned bishop recently assured me that they were not less pronounced in their doctrine respecting the Real Presence of the Person of Christ in the Eucharist, and that the Scotch Presbyterians had never been Zwinglians,

but held to a Real Presence. In a recent volume on the Church and the Sacraments, by Principal Forsyth, there is decisive evidence of the positive restlessness in the Free Church respecting their former doctrine of the presence of Christ in the Sacrament. He appeals to his Church to "get rid of the idea which has impoverished worship beyond measure, that the act is mainly commemoration. No Church can live on that. How can we have a mere memorial on one who is still alive, still our life, still present with us and acting in us?"

"A sacrament is as much more than a symbol as a symbol is more than a memorial. It is not an hour of instruction but of communion. It is an act created by the eternal Act of Christ which made and makes the Church. It is Christ's act offering Himself to men. Christ offers anew to us, as He did at the Supper, the finished offering which on the Cross He gave to God once for all." It is a sacramental act in the Lord's Supper. God's grace is given through the media of the bread and wine, as the stream is given through the conduit. "This grace fills the sacraments always with the same power that gave them being. So there is a certain place for the idea of the *opus operatum* in the sacraments." "The deed of God comes home through a living soul indeed but chiefly in its own wealth and power—the same yesterday, to-day and forever."

"If the elements are and remain material, the act which uses them is spiritual and real. Whatever is symbolical, the action is real. In so far as our action is symbolical, it is symbolical of Christ's Act, not of His essence. But it is symbolical in the ancient sense of the word symbol. It does not simply point to the thing signified nor suggest it, but conveys it, has it within it, brings it with it, gives it, does something, is really sacramental." Christ seems to say to the communicant: "This bread, broken and eaten, represents the giving and the partaking of my person. But there is far more than a memorial of an event or a mere symbol of an idea."

"It was symbolic in the great sense and really sacra-

mental. It does more than *mean*—it *conveys* what it means." "The great meaning of the passage and of the rite depends on our personal and present relation to Christ, and on our conception of Him."

Harnack states: "What is nowadays understood by 'symbol' is a thing which it not that which it represents; at that time (i. e., the early Christian centuries) symbol denoted a thing which, in some kind of sense, really is what it signifies; but on the other hand, according to the ideas of the period, the really heavenly element by either in or behind, the visible form without investing itself with it. According to *distinction* of a symbolic from a realistic conception of the Supper is altogether to be rejected." *Lehrbuch der Dogmatic*, quoted by Gore.

"The Lord's Supper was historically attached to Jewish usage—to the paschal feast." Jesus "lays stress on the bread first as the essence of the matter. He does not lay it on the flesh in the meal, as if He would avert a connection with His mere flesh and fix it on His body or person." 236. "It was Christ's body that was taken, not His flesh. The presence of His body meant, in symbolic language, the presence of His person. The body means the entire person and presence of Christ. He will, symbolized by the bread, be there in person, breaking the bread of life." "The elements are made sacramental by promise and by use; they are not transmuted in substance. They are charged with Christ, but not converted into Christ."

In the sacrament we have much more than mere emblems, we have real conveyance. What is given to us is Christ Himself, His person." "The great matter is to recognize the real Presence in holy and saving action; the minor matter is the rationale of His procedure."

"It was a sacrament that Christ made at the Lord's Supper and not a sacrifice," but in time "the sacramental side was subordinated to the sacrificial." Our Church places great emphasis upon the unique character of the Eucharist and its special blessings for the communicant; and our people show their faith and high appreciation of

the actual benefits by their faithful attendance. As an illustration, a laboring man, through a misunderstanding as to the hour of worship, did not reach the church until the Communion service had closed. He had walked many miles and his disappointment was great. His soul was greatly stirred and he could not suppress the intense feeling of disappointment; and after the benediction was pronounced, he told the pastor of his great sorrow, saying: I did so *build upon it*." The faithful pastor saw his duty, and did it by solemnly administering the Holy Communion to the one who, with intense longing and with eyes fixed upon Jesus, had walked so many miles to meet and receive his Saviour in the sacrament of the Lord's Supper.

We cannot emphasize too strongly the importance of the sacrament of the Lord's Supper. The word and the sacraments cannot be separated and the one subordinated to the other; but each must ever be given its place, and they must continue together in the Christian Church as they have from the beginning of the primitive Church. In fact that which constitutes a Christian Church is a body of believers among whom the Word is preached and the sacraments administered in accordance with the teachings of Christ.

In the Holy Communion we publicly confess Christ as our once crucified but risen and exalted Redeemer who instituted the Eucharist and who now gives Himself to us when we partake of the bread and wine. We are taught that in this sacrament Christ gives us something, and we look forward to this Holy Communion expecting in accordance with His word, to receive something. We take Christ at His word. He gives Himself and we receive something substantial. It is no mere sentiment expressed in a figure of speech, which conveys no special, substantial blessing. There was something in Christ's words of the Institution, when He took bread, blessed and brake it and said to His disciples as He gave it to them: "Take, eat; this is my body." When He used this unqualified language on this solemn occasion, there was profound

impressiveness in His speech and feeling. That utterance came from the depths of His soul, and He knew the significance of His own words and the impression that He would convey to His disciples. I cannot conceive of Him using such language if He only intended it in a merely figurative sense; for He could easily have qualified it, or used such plain language that could not have been interpreted as so many have understood it.

"We are become partakers of Christ," (Heb. 3:14) but where is this so effectually realized as in that Supper, where in the bread that we eat we have communion or participation in the body of Christ. Christ once for all, when He offered up Himself obtained eternal redemption for us through the sacrifice of His own body on the cross. Hence we are emboldened by the blood of Jesus shed for us, to come in faith with assurance and conviction that Christ Himself, the unseen, is really present in the sacrament of the altar. I say we may come with this assurance; for many have realized the conviction so clearly and profoundly in its effects upon their being and life, that the evidential reasons could not be gainsaid,—no more than in the case of the young man whose sight Jesus had restored. He could not explain and answer their questions, but he had the unshaken conviction that whilst once he was blind now he could see, and all the logic of the most learned ones could not convince him to the contrary. Such evidence is the most soul-satisfying to the Christian, and it cannot be overthrown nor silenced by the sophistry of the most learned unbeliever. The God-consciousness is His direct witness to the soul.

We all believe in our mystical union with Christ though it surpasses our comprehension. The same is true of the real presence of the Person of Christ. Here we enter into the most intimate and vital union with Him. It is the divinely appointed means by which are conveyed to us the blessings and life that Christ secured by His sufferings, death and resurrection.

In this sacrament Christ is the giver, and He gives Himself through these outward symbols. He is the in-

visible grace. He is present though we see Him not. When Christ said, "Take, etc.," He gave something, and we must not explain that something away. We accept His words unchanged, with faith and without unbelief, even though we can neither explain nor fully comprehend them. The real man himself is as invisible as Christ. The face is often the real inner-man only in disguise. We cannot see the most real hidden man of the heart, but only the outward expression.

The sacrament of the Lord's Supper may be designated as the visible embodiment of Christ in His work of redemption. These elements are not only signs of the inward grace, but the channels through Christ in His presence conveys to us special grace. We appropriate Christ in a special sense, for is it not in the words of the Apostle, "a communion with the body of Christ?"

"The Analogy of the Faith," as I recall it, was a familiar theological term when a student at this Seminary, and doubtless it still continues (whether in the same formula or not), to express an important truth that should be observed in order to arrive at the meaning of some disputed passage. In seeking to determine the exact meaning that St. Paul attached to the doctrine of the Lord's Supper as he describes it in I Cor. 11:25, we cannot escape the impression that he regarded it as a sacrament of momentous import that could not be abused with impunity; for he warns them against such profane violation by referring them to the severe and even fatal judgments that were meted out to some in disregarding the solemn character of this divine ordinance, in which they had failed to discern the body of our Lord.

I know the attempts to rid the language of all divine content, and the various expedients to eliminate the Person of Christ from the profoundly significant words used in the Apostle's warning to the communicant. "For he that eateth and drinketh, eateth and drinketh judgment unto himself, if he discern not the body. For this cause many among you are weak and sickly, and not a few sleep." It cannot be safe exegesis to resolve at once to

explain away that "body" just because it is not in harmony with our views of the Lord's Supper. We cannot reduce the words to a meaningless phrase, emptied of all content. It is natural to conclude that Paul who must have understood what he was saying, likewise meant what he was saying, and why would he have warned them against not discerning the body, if he did not wish to convey the impression that the body of Christ was really present in that sacrament?

But we are left in a dilemma, for in the preceding chapter St. Paul explains what he really meant by that ambiguous word "*σῶμα*" that has troubled so many in their efforts to interpret the writer of this Epistle. The familiar words in I Cor. 10:16: "The bread which we break, is it not a communion of the body of Christ?" In this explanatory and emphatic passage he uses the same word for the body of Christ, and his meaning of the Lord's Supper seems unmistakable." It may therefore be assumed," as Dr. Andrews states, "that these words represent not merely the Apostle's own view, but the theory which was universally accepted and regarded as axiomatic by the Christian Church in his day." 151.

We may learn something from the analogy that St. Paul gives between the Lord's Supper and the well known feasts among the pagans. Whilst he did not recognize the existence of their deities—outside of their imaginations, he knew that they were real to the mind of the pagan worshippers, and hence the force of his reasoning is not weakened by their non-existence. He refers to the existing beliefs, and these were real facts that exerted a potent influence over the minds and lives of the worshippers, for they believe that in their pagan feasts, they actually entered into participation with their deities, and the Apostle has this in mind in his argument. Hence he would have the Christians believe that in the Eucharist they really enter into communion or participation with the body and blood of Christ.

He must have used the word Communion in the current sense of his times when referring to the pagan wor-



shippers at their feasts in the temple, and he did not intend that it should be understood in a different sense, so as to bring it into accord with some modern conceptions as to what the writer should have meant to say. As Kirsopp Lake states: "St. Paul clearly means that the Corinthians knew quite well that the Eucharist is a rite which really conveys that which the heathen erroneously thought to obtain in their sacrificial meals—that is, participation in the Divine nature."

It seems to me that the language of St. Paul cannot be harmonized with any more symbolical view. So grievous is the sin of those who eat and drink in an unworthy manner, that they are held responsible for profaning the Body and Blood of the Lord, not recognizing the sanctity of the Body. The Apostle reminds them of the judgment that had been visited upon them, in the form of sickness and even death. I have always felt that it was most unfortunate that in the so-called Authorized Version, the *mistranslation* made timid souls fearful of the Eucharist, lest they might thereby incur "damnation" instead of receiving Christ. But at all events the penal judgment was of such a serious character that the sin committed must have been correspondingly great, and this we can easily understand with the doctrine of the real presence of the Person of Christ in the Lord's Supper.

For years I have been interested in the study of comparative religions. It is the scientific method, for comparison brings out the real qualities of resemblances and differences, and sheds valuable side lights upon certain features of Christian faith and worship. Hence it must not be overlooked when we seek to interpret the meaning of the Holy Communion in the primitive Church. In fact, in a critical study of the doctrine of the Eucharist, it is important to give and have clearly in mind an historical setting of the circumstances connected with the Institution of the Lord's Supper and its relation to the Passover, as well as the nature of the cotemporary pagan feasts and the light they throw upon the meaning of the crucial words employed in their communions with their

gods. The ancient Greeks had pronounced and profound convictions as to their close communion with their gods. It was under various aspects that this personal communion was sought and realized, but the *sacramental* must have been the highest. The precise method through which they attained it varied, though generally some sacred animal was selected as representing the anthropomorphic god, and in the mind of the worshippers, they by partaking of its flesh and blood, at the same time actually partook of the god's own life and self, for they ate the god.

The Apostle Paul had knowledge of their belief and practices as his references show; and he did not invent a new language, but used old words taken from the pagan feasts to express the Christian ideas contained in the Holy Communion of the Lord's Supper. He did not borrow from them this sacred ordinance, nor the Christian conceptions, for he received these from the Lord as he tells us, but he used the familiar pagan terms for expressing them.

In the pagan cults the Greeks discerned the presence of their god, and they believed that they realized actual communion or participation with the body and even ate the god.

Hence, had St. Paul not really recognized and believed as he clearly states in positive language, the real presence of the body (glorified) of Christ, in the Lord's Supper, then he would never have made use of such positive terms as when he declared: "The bread which we break, is it not the communion of the body of Christ?" for in his day such words could have had but one meaning. Taking the view of a cotemporary it seems to me that his language could admit of no interpretation less than that of the Real Presence of the glorified body of Christ when he denounced the grievous sin committed at Corinth in their shameful abuses through "*not discerning the Body*" in the Holy Communion. He certainly meant that Christ's body was there or else he would not have condemned them for not discerning that Body. Hence the Lutheran Scrip-

tural view is fully sustained by an appeal to the cotemporary use of the terms employed in this holy ordinance, with which St. Paul was thoroughly familiar.

Following the words: "Shall be under guilt of violating the Body and Blood of the Lord," Plummer says: "Dishonor to the symbols is dishonor to that which they represent." "What is certain is that those who rightly receive the consecrated bread and wine in the Eucharist, receive spiritually the body and blood of Christ. How this takes place is beyond our comprehension, and it is vain to claim knowledge which cannot be possessed; or to attempt to explain what cannot be explained." He quotes Bishop Thirlwall: "If there is a point on which the virtues of Scriptures, of the purest ecclesiastical tradition and of our own Church is more express and uniform than another, it is the peculiar and transcendent quality of the blessing which this sacrament both represents and exhibits, and consequently of the presence by which that blessing is conferred. How this presence differed from that of which we are assured by our Lord's promise, where two or three are gathered together in His name—whether only in degree or in kind, it is beyond the power of human language to define, and of human thought to conceive. It is a subject fit, not for curious speculation but for the exercise of pious meditation and devotional feeling; and it is one in which there is a certainty that the highest flight of contemplation will always fall short of the Divine reality." (I Cor. p. 244).

We do not interpret nor exhaust the meaning of the Apostle's significant words: "Not discerning the body" by dismissing them as only a figurative expression; for they must convey and contain some real, positive essence or else why was the sin of those so great at Corinth that many were visited with divine chastisement and even death? There is no gain in seeking to remove the Christ who says to the communicant, "Take, eat; this is my body." Through the spiritual eating of faith, we received Him. Nay, since every soul realizes such a need of Christ and would enjoy personal fellowship with Him

through this communion or participation with His body, as St. Paul says, we have in the Lord's Supper, why then should men strive to argue Him out of their doctrine of this sacrament? With less effort they might find Christ really present in His Humanity as well as in His Divinity, and realize the blessedness of those who in the Eucharist, discern the Lord's body.

Dr. Chadwick, Dean of Armaugh, in his exposition of the bread and wine in St. Mark's Gospel says: "But bread and wine do not express an indefinite Divine help; they express the body and blood of Christ; they have to do with His Humanity. We must beware of limiting overmuch. At the Supper He said not 'my flesh,' but 'my body,' which is plainly a more comprehensive term. And we may not so carnalize the Body as to exclude the Person who bestows Himself. Yet is all the language so constructed as to force the conviction upon us that His body and blood, His Humanity, is the special gift of the Lord's Supper. As man He redeemed us, and as man He imparts Himself to man." How well does such a doctrine of the sacrament harmonize with the declaration of St. Paul: "I live, and yet no longer I, but Christ liveth in me." p. 382.

In section XXXVI-XXXVIII of the Gallican Confession, originally prepared by Calvin, but later revised and adopted by all the Reformed Churches, including the Church of England, we find some very positive and explicit statements that rival in materialistic literalism some of the most pronounced expressions of confessional Lutheranism. "We confess that the Lord's Supper which is the second sacrament, is a witness of the union which we have with Christ, inasmuch as He not only died and rose again for us once, but also feeds and nourishes us truly with His flesh and blood. By the secret and incomprehensible power of His spirit He feeds and strengthens us with the *substance of His body and His blood*. We hold that this is done spiritually, not because we put imagination and fancy in the place of fact and truth, but because the greatness of this mystery exceeds the measure

of our senses and the laws of nature. In short because it is heavenly; it can only be apprehended by faith."

"We believe that in the Lord's Supper, God gives us really and in fact that which He there sets forth to us; and that consequently, with these signs is given the true possession and enjoyment of that which they present to us. For the body and blood of Christ give food and drink to the soul, no less than bread and wine nourish the body." The body of Christ is our meat, and His blood our drink. And we reject the Enthusiasts and Sacramentarians who will not receive such signs and marks, although our Saviour said: "This is my body, and this is my blood." (Schaff's Creeds of Christendom, III,381).

## ARTICLE II.

## AN INTERPRETATION OF THE WORLD WAR.

BY EDWIN HEYL DELK.

For any complete and definitive interpretation of the World War we shall have to wait years. There is, however, enough known of the historical and philosophical background, enough of State papers and personal memoranda, enough of patent facts and avowed policies to offer a tentative interpretation of the World War. Whether we can, or can not, truly formulate an explanation of it all every thinking man has to frame some mental picture and judgment of the facts and forces at work producing this world cataclysm.

## THE HISTORICAL BACKGROUND.

David Jayne Holl has said, "The great tragedy of history has been the conflict between the universal humanism that Rome endeavored to establish, first by law, and afterward by faith, and the tribalism of the primitive European races." This conflict between imperial policy and nascent nationalisms was inevitable. The Roman dream was imposing but impossible. Military force, despite Rome's acceptance of the provincial institutions and colonial temper of conquered territory was the dominant power in holding the empire together. There was too great a diversity of tribal temperament and culture on the part of the scattered people to accept the social and legal ideals of Rome. Beneficent as was much of the rule of the Augustian period the latent love of autonomy and liberty, the urge of the tribal and national spirit inevitably caused the disintegration of the empire and prepared the way for the assertion of the Gallic, Teutonic and Slavic spirit in Europe. If it was a tragedy, it had its compensations in a diversified culture and a stimulat-

ing rivalry in commerce, discovery and the arts. But the dream of a revived world empire has never perished in the heart of the ambitious European Kings.

Another fact must be kept in mind. Every great European State was the creation of force. Russia, Spain, Scandinavia, France, Italy, England, Germany, each and all, at some point in its career, was established through the might of arms. This is Europe's heritage of evil. The mark of blood is upon them all. The period of violent contest, for some, has drifted into the haze of history and imperialism has become a spent force, but the emergence of all into national greatness was secured by either a ruthless diplomacy or force. Some of them have repented of their ways but their example still lingers as a incitement to war for ambitious, war-bred Germany.

#### THE GROWTH OF THE GERMAN EMPIRE.

The growth of the German Empire seems to justify militarism as the method of national growth and power. Modern Germany is the only great nation of Europe which has profited by continental wars. The Modern German Empire began in the scrubby Mark of Brandenburg and developed by military strength first into Prussia. Prussia under Frederick William, Frederick the First and Frederick the Great, dominating by the military methods of the Hohenzollerns took Silesia, Poland, Schleswig-Holstein. Later she threw off the Austrian demnities. Her history seems to contradict the dictum that they who take the sword shall perish by Lorraine as the fruit of the Franco-Prussian War. Then as an Empire of the first class she stood forth in shining armor. A rapid sketch of the history of the Empire, to German eyes, justifies militarism as the method of national expansion and power. Her wars of the last hundred years have not been expensive either in men or material. Her conquests brought lands, man-power and indemnities. Her history seems to contradict the dictum that they who take the sword shall perish by the sword." Spain's Empire had melted away.



France had learned that the Napoleonic dream of world-power was fruitless. Russia has proven a mass of conglomerate peoples held together by autocratic force and bureaucracy. England had learned that imperialism and colonization were antipodal in feeling and had to surrender to the autonomy of Canada and Australia, and the Boer Republic. But Germany persisted in the good old way of *faustrecht* as the method of conquest and control. Her history is her justification for being. War was in her blood. The Latin peoples she acknowledged were brave, artistic, emotional but corrupt. She, the incarnation of the Teutonic spirit, was lusty, determined and efficient. Diplomacy and the method of peaceful penetration had their place but the shining sword was the sure method of conquest and control. Steel was the back-bone of her might and by blood and iron she would hack her way to still further greatness. Every man was to be made a soldier, the whole nation must be organized for the ends of war. The whole people must be impregnated with the militaristic spirit. The lesser German kingdoms took their cue from Prussia and her pulpits, her schools and universities were made auxiliary to her regiments and war-lords.

#### THE GERMAN THEORY OF THE STATE.

The philosophy of a State, like the philosophy of the individual, is the product of life's desires and history rather than of pure thought. To the abstract thinking of her philosophers German history brought the concrete facts of her military conquests and the combination appears in the German theory of the State. Kant's "Categorical Imperative" was taken from the realm of personal moral duties as a sort of stem on which the after theory was to be engrafted. Hegel had declared the State the supreme moral personality. Fichte had infused the idea of power as the essence of the State. Absolute sovereignty was already vested in the king. All that was needed was some philosopher or historian who could fire and fuse the

spirit of the whole people with such conceptions of the State. There was called to Berlin some forty-five years ago the man who saturated the university men with such notions. Treitschke taught that "the State was the highest expression of reason"; that "the State is Power"; that "there is no moral law higher than its own will"; in a word that "might is right." Weaker nations were the legitimate prey of great peoples. The German State in Treitschke's eyes was the supreme political creation of modern history. Bernhardi added the dicta "that war is a biological necessity," and that "God would see to it that war should never be eliminated from history." Christianity was accepted as a good working philosophy between individuals and groups within the nation, but it had no place or application between nations. The German theory of the State is frankly pagan. Such a theory plus a mania for power arms a people for any adventure however ruthless and selfish it may be. Such a theory becomes a terror to thinking men of Christian spirit. Other peoples theoretically acknowledge that the same moral law applies to States as to individuals. The German theory of the State denies any higher regulative power than its own will and purpose.

#### THE RISE AND RIGHT OF KULTUR.

The Germans have not been the great inventors and discoverers of the world. The discovery of a few chemical and biological facts are to its credit but science has had equal masters to those of Germany in England, Italy and France. Germany has taken the inventions of other people and wrought them to perfection. She is a master in thoroughness and efficiency. She organizes and tabulates to the last fraction. She is so constructed commercially and politically that every foreign business becomes a part of her statecraft. In music and philosophy she stands in the front rank, but they are accomplishments in her past. Her modern kultur is bent on efficiency and conquest through every industrial and commercial

agency. After the Franco-Prussian War the immense indemnity she secured from France made a fruitful nest-egg for her future development in industrialism. Her later industrial development has brought her wealth and commercial power. Money is the sinew of war. Slowly but surely she was laying up through the eager, trained and subservient middle and working classes that fund of energy and wealth which would fit her for her program of mastery of world. Her lines of steamships and commercial agencies became a net work of propaganda. She believes her kultur the best the world has ever seen. It was destined to command all others. The world would be benefited by Germanization even at the point of the sword. Wherever Germans went they were urged to carry their kultur with them and never forget their allegiance to the Fatherland. Dual citizenship was applauded. "The Day" would come when all their discipline and talent would blaze forth as "Deutschland uber alles." But the result of this kultur has been set forth by one of her commercial princes

"The Germans—alas that I should be forced to say it who am a German myself—are different from all other nations," Herr Muehlton continued. "They are really a race apart from the rest of mankind. The good instincts they originally possessed and which were generally recognized a hundred and even fifty years ago, have been systematically perverted by their rulers. The Prussian system of government has gradually transformed what was once the 'nation of poets and philosophers' into a race of basest materialists the world has ever seen. Materialism and cowardly submission to their rulers had become the dominant traits of the Germans long before the war. And the war, which has enabled the Prussian military and bureaucratic machine to suppress even the last remaining vestiges of individual liberty in Germany, has intensified these evil characteristics tenfold. There is no difference in this respect between the financial magnate and the workingman."

## THE PLAN OF A MITTLE EUROPA.

The motive power in this great war is the plan of a great central Teutonic Empire comprising and dominating the whole of Middle Europe. It would have as its nucleus Germany and the Austro-Hungarian Empire. Its creators look backward to the age when Teutonic peoples dominated not only present-day Germany and Austria, but the contiguous countries of the Baltic provinces of Russia, Holland, Belgium and Switzerland. In order, however, to control the sources of wealth necessary to feed and develop this territory, Servia, Bulgaria, Roumania and Turkey must be merged into the confederation and the Danube River become a Teutonic stream from its source to its mouth. To insure its successful development in the South-east a railroad must find its Eastern terminus at the Persian Gulf. Germany secured this right of way for a railroad through Asia Minor through subsidiary companies. Her plan was that a great artery of trade should be opened from Hamburg to the Persian Gulf. Her projects were almost realized in this direction. The motive was dominantly economic. The war is at base an economic war. The lust for wealth is now in the blood of the German people. Commercial greed is sustained by the military arm of the government. The flag actually follows the line of commercial expansion. Three writers above all others have stood forth as the protagonists of the Middle Europe dream. Paul Rorbach, Frederick Neuman and above all Otto Tannenberg, have pleaded and planned for this commercial and political plan of domination. National pride and the desire of vast monetary advantage are forces easily aroused. All the writers recognized the limitations of the German temperament in colonization and administration but all of them are assured of the desirability and possibility of securing the co-operation of the peoples necessary for the plan. To this end all sorts of measures were adopted to make the dream a reality. The marriage of Hohenzollerns to available princesses and princes, espionage, branches of the

Reichsbank established in different countries, royal visits were interchanged, and German military training and officers were secured for the peoples whose territory were to be parts of the great Empire. This Middle Europe once established would stand as a great colossus separating Russia from Western Europe and dominate the European world. England would be weakened in her hold on India and Egypt. France was degenerate, England was a nation of shopkeepers, Russia was a medley of heterogeneous States and all that was needed was a bold and decisive thrust towards the South-east and the plan could be accomplished. This was the belief of her military leaders and many of her economists and junker statesmen. Rohrbach and Neuman did not believe war was essential for the realization of the dream, but Tannenburg would stop at no measure to realize the plan. The idea has become fixed. At the present moment the plan from a purely military point of view has been accomplished. The problem of reconciliation to a German political and economical lordship over the Hungarian, Russian, Bulgarian and Turk is a different problem, but each and all of Germany's allies are in a state of military vassalage and she may succeed in securing this submission if not allegiance to her plan. Nothing is more ruthless than the desire and hope of wealth. The material and military advantage of the Middle Europe plan has silenced the mass of the German people who are promised great pecuniary rewards. This dream is the real motive power in the war. To talk of national defense as the motive is throwing sand into the eyes of those who make cannon fodder for the commercialized, militaristic leaders of Germany.

#### THE HOHENZOLLERN KAISER.

It would be impossible to ignore the personality and traditions of Emperor William in any interpretation of the great war. Whatever may have been his personal attitude as the "Peace Keeper" of Europe toward France, England and Russia up till 1911, after the Agadir inci-

dent, he was won over by the War Party to the inevitableness of a clash with France and England. Russian hegemony in the Balkans was in opposition to his far eastern program. He loves the pose of the "Knight in shining armor." His general culture and versatility is beyond dispute. His theatrical appearances and ambition to be the monarch par excellence are his weaknesses. There are two factors in his inheritance which we must keep in mind if we are to have an illuminating interpretation of the Kaiser's part in the world conflict. First he represents the culmination of the Hohenzollern dynasty. Caesar, Charlemagne and Frederick the Great have been the master influences in his conception of rulership. Pride in his illustrious family holds his reverent regard. His statue is to stand with theirs in Siegesalle in Berlin. He wishes to transmit to posterity the dynastic glories of the Hohenzollerns. For this reason he will fight to the bitter end. Further he embodies the outworn idea of "the divine right of kings." Democracy to him is fallacious and impotent as a world power. Despite the limitations imposed upon him as Emperor by a constitution, as the King of Prussia, he still lives in the spirit of the Eighteenth Century. He said to his Prussian subjects, "You Germans have only one will and that is my will; there is only one law, and that is my law; only one master in this country, that is I, and who opposes me I shall crush to pieces." This attitude he sustains to the other States of Germany. His dramatic journey and entrance into the city of Jerusalem as the protector of Islam was typical of his role. The erection of his statue in the semi-fortified German building overlooking Jerusalem and his acquiescence in the myth that in some way he is the descendant of Mohammed, are all revelations of both his ambition and weakness. In his mind no other man enjoys the unction of a divine guidance such as his. He is the anointed of God for the development of Teutonic ideas and culture in a degenerate world.

## THE PREPARATION FOR THE WAR.

It is difficult for us to set any precise date when the preparations for this world-war began. Some date it shortly after the Franco-Prussian War of 1871. We are on sure ground, however, when we reach the early years of the Twentieth Century. The flirtation with Turkey began and the domination of The War Council was brought to bear on the Kaiser. The great naval policy was announced. At The Hague Conference Germany refused to limit her naval program. Italian statesmen have revealed Germany's determination to back Austria against Serbia as far back as 1912. In 1913 a war-credit of \$250,000,000 was demanded of the Reichstag. Railroads were built to the Belgian frontier. Extra taxation was placed upon the financial classes to the point of irritation. The army was increased in numbers. The people were impregnated with a hatred of England. The Socialists' program was adopted so far as material comforts for the working-classes was concerned. A fuller participation by the people in government and a more equitable franchise was hinted at. Germany's navy was to be made equal to her army in mass and power. "The Day" was drank as a toast by her military and naval leaders. When the hour came she would be ready to strike. Some occasion would arise when her forces would be let loose upon France and Russia. England would prove either unprepared or pliant to diplomacy. A quick, overwhelming rush to Paris and then a massed attack on Russia would secure her coveted position. The murder of Archduke Ferdinand at Serajevo furnished the occasion of putting into motion her well laid plans of dominion. Austria was backed in her impossible demands upon Serbia. Mr. Morgenthau, then our ambassador in Constantinople, tells us that Baron Wangenheim, German ambassador to Turkey, told him that on July 5, 1914, three weeks before war was begun, there was held at Potsdam a conference of the military, naval and financial leaders with the Kaiser, at which time it was determined



to begin the war on August first. The Kaiser went on his usual Scandinavian sea-trip and the Austrian representatives on their summer jaunts to throw the diplomatic world off its guard. All the diplomacy at the end of the month of July was mere camouflage. Every attempt of England and Russia to placate the German purpose was hopeless and futile. The die had been cast. Germany would back Austria and threaten Russia, bargain with France and Belgium. England was on the verge of civil war in Ireland. Now was the accepted time. The revelations made by the German Ambassador to England, Lichnowsky, are now before the world. These are his conclusions declared in his private memorandum:

"As appears from all official publications, without the facts being controverted by our own White Book, which, owing to its poverty and gaps, constitutes a grave self-accusation:

"1. We encouraged Count Berchtold to attack Serbia, although no German interest was involved, and the danger of a world war must have been known to us—whether we knew the text of the ultimatum is a question of complete indifference.

"2. In the days between July 23 and July 30, 1914, when M. Sazonoff emphatically declared that Russia could not tolerate an attack upon Serbia, we rejected the British proposals of mediation, although Serbia, under Russian and British pressure, had accepted almost the whole ultimatum, and although an agreement about the two points in question could easily have been reached, and Count Berchtold was even ready to satisfy himself with the Serbian reply.

"3. On July 30, when Count Berchtold wanted to give way, we, without Austria having been attacked, replied to Russia's mere mobilization by sending an ultimatum to St. Petersburg, and on July 31 we declared war on the Russians, although the Czar had pledged his word that as long as negotiations continued not a man should march—so that we deliberately destroyed the possibility of a peaceful settlement.

"In view of these indisputable facts, it is not surprising that the whole civilized world outside Germany attributes to us the sole guilt for the world war."

#### METHOD OF WARFARE.

In quick succession war was declared with Russia, France, Belgium and England.

We were staggered by Germany's method of warfare. Her violation of Belgian neutrality was the first offense. This treaty made with the great powers neutralizing Belgium had been distinctly acknowledged at the time of the Franco-Prussian War by Prussia. Soon news of the atrocities perpetrated upon helpless and unarmed non-combatants in Belgium reached us. We could not believe that such outrages were possible on the part of a modern civilized people. The Belgian, the French, and the Bryce Commissions later confirmed the policy of frightfulness practiced by the German commanders. We read then then war-manuals and discovered that "schreckliche" was an integral part of the German philosophy of war. If she could by quick and ruthless destruction of property and life destroy the morale of an invaded country such a policy would break the spirit of its fighting men and so shorten the war. Then came the sinking of the Lusitania. She was an unarmed vessel carrying freight and passengers. There was no search made to discover the character of the cargo. She was sunk without a moment's warning. No aid was given to over a thousand helpless men, women and children. Over a hundred neutral Americans perished in the sea. It was sheer murder. But Germany rejoiced and had medals struck off in commemoration of the hellish deed. This opened our eyes as to the character of her warfare. Then followed the herding of the civilian population of Belgium and their deportation as cattle to work on German farms and manufactories. Some were made to engage in direct military work in support of the German armies. The Armenian massacres by the Turks totaling seven hundred

and fifty thousand was countenanced by Germany who could have checked the slaughter. The world now realized that a wild-beast had been let loose upon the world. Germany has gone on crushing disrupted and distracted States and still seeks to justify her methods of conquest.

#### THE UNITED STATES INVOLVED.

For over quarter of a century the people of the United States had been trained to look upon arbitration as the rational and effective method of settling international differences. Militarism had no defenders. We imagined that all other civilized nations respected treaties and sought by methods of diplomacy and international courts to avoid the destructiveness and horrors of modern warfare. We believed that another great European war could be prevented by either conciliation or arbitration of disputes. We were unaware that any nation entertained plans of aggression in Europe. Entertaining no desire for territorial aggrandizement ourselves we imagined that the status-quo in Europe was to endure. We were living, however, in a fool's paradise. There were English, French and Italian statesmen who knew the truth. We had been schooled against "entangling alliances" abroad and felt that we could preserve our neutrality as a government in any foreign war. We failed to see that we too are a world-power and that our future is intensely associated with Europe and Asia. The first call of our President at the outbreak of the war was for neutrality as a nation. But events and the actions of the Central Powers made neutrality an impossibility. The German people first objected to our furnishing munitions to her foes. This was an unreasonable objection. Germany had done the same thing in the Boer War. Such sale by private manufacturers has always been looked upon as legal. Then the German government placed spies and concocted all sorts of plots to destroy our ammunition plants and means of land and sea communication with England and France. She sought to seduce Mexico by

promising parts of the United States in case of victory. Through Mexico she sought to win Japan to her plan of conquest. Then followed the sinking of our cargo ships by German submarines. Zones vast in their inclusion were prescribed within which no ship of ours could sail without instant destruction. Gradually our people saw the program for world domination which was entertained by leading German statesmen and economists. The Germanization of vast territories in South America and of sections of American society was revealed. The full significance of the war did not reveal itself until the freedom of seas and the resumption of the merciless submarine war-fare made neutrality impossible. Hoping against hope and patiently waiting the President finally called upon Congress in April 1917, to declare a state of war existed with Germany. With no purposes of aggression, coveted territory, nor spoils of wealth, we were drawn into the maelstrom which threatened to engulf the world's civilization and ideals of our government which have been built up during a century of history. We had to fight Germany now with our allies or meet her alone later.

#### WHAT WE FIGHT FOR.

The ends for which we contend are the purest and profoundest that ever drove a nation into battle. We are fighting first of all for national safety. The United States—her ideals of government and place in the world are threatened by the dynastic ideals and military power of Germany. We are fighting for national honor. We can not be dictated to by any foreign power. We know the privileges granted by international law and are determined to defend them. We believe that treaties are more than scraps of paper. This we believe is a war against war. We hope to break the might of militarism for all time. We are trying "to make the world safe for democracy." We see the weakness of democracy in peace and war but we believe that through civil and political freedom and experience a better type of manhood is pro-

duced and a wider justice between class and class is established through the democratic spirit than in a country where men are subjects and sovereignty doled out by kings. Democracy is not a form of government but a spirit, a faith, a program of human rights and duties. It is a fight for the establishment of arbitration rather than force as a method of settling international quarrels. In the final analysis this war is a contest of two oppugnant ideas, i. e., might vs. justice. On the one hand stands military autocracy with its plan of dominion over weaker peoples and on the other the spirit of international justice, liberty and fellowship. We believe that it is the inherent right of every people to determine their own form of government. We fight for the right and might of righteousness as over against a selfish and cruel creed of a pagan faith in force. It is a contest in the world of spiritual ideas, a clash between the spirit of the German god Odin and the Christian God as revealed in the character and program of Jesus Christ. The two ideals can not both live on forever. One or the other must perish. We know, as Disraeli said, that we are "on the side of the angels." Love, not might, is the deepest note in all human relations. Right and love must win finally in the world contest.

#### WHAT WE HOPE FOR.

First we hope for a new spirit of nationalism. We must abandon the idea of absolute sovereignty in any State. Our American contribution to the theory of the State was that the individual has certain personal rights to liberty and the pursuit of happiness that no government, be it an absolute monarchy, republic or a mob, dare take from him. The State is not absolute but is created and conditioned by the will of its individual citizens. This truth has not been accepted by the leading nations in their theory of government. We hope for the removal of all those artificial restrictions of trade and commerce be-

tween nations which are the occasions of international jealousies and friction. Tariffs which shut the door to free and national interchange of products must go. Commercial wars easily lead to military contests. If any stable peace is to be established the natural freedom of trade must be secured. We hope for a greater measure of justice between classes, races and States. Our men in the trenches will return from our battle fields with a new sense of political power and democracy. Privileged classes, races and States must suffer a change of heart in the presence of the world conflict for the ideals which underlies our fighting. A new sense of social, racial and international solidarity will be operative. Old injustices must perish and new privileges secured if a righteous peace within and without the nation is to be established. We hope that some sort of a league to enforce peace can be established. The old balance of power scheme has failed us and we must find some better way of binding the nations to prevent the repetition of such a world calamity as we now have to endure. We shall insist that the moral law as applied to individuals be operative between nations. Above all we must utilize the power of Christianity in the creation of a nobler spirit and program than nationalism. This war is the result of Germany's denial of the kingship of Jesus Christ in international relations. We are beginning to see that His realm is not only among individuals and social groups but that His ideal of the Kingdom of God includes the gracious domination of nations and States. To this hope and fact of the kingship of Jesus Christ the Church and chancelleries have been aspostate. The Fatherhood of God and the spirit and kingdom of the Prince of Peace is the world's final hope in the midst of the blind strife that threatens civilization to-day. The kingdoms of the earth are His by divine right of love and world redemption, and He only can make all things new.

*Philadelphia, Pa.*

## ARTICLE III.

## THE FIRST PROTESTANT SYSTEMATIC THEOLOGY.

A WORD ON MELANCHTHON'S LOCI.<sup>1</sup>

BY PROFESSOR JOHN ALFRED FAULKNER.

In December 1521 Melanchthon published his *Loci Communes Rerum theologicarum seu Hypotyposes Theologicae* (Common Places of Theological Matters or Theological Outlines). The Germans translate the first words *Grundbegriffe* or *Leitbegriffe*, fundamentals, or leading conceptions). It was his intention to give only those points which had to do mostly with an understanding of the Scripture. "I write no commentary," he says, "but sketch in the way of a general outline those points which one has to keep chiefly before his eyes in the study of Scripture." He would enter into no discussion of deity, incarnation, Trinity, which is unfruitful. The object of the sending of Christ is to bring to men a knowledge of himself, therefore only those articles are indispensably necessary which help along this work for men, namely, sin, law and grace. The celebrated passage in the introduction says:

<sup>1</sup> As this study intends to give an account of the first formal Protestant treatise in theology, it is based on the first edition of the "Loci," of which we have an admirable issue in Plitt-Kolde, "Die Loci Communes Philipp Melanchthons in ihrer Urgestalt," 3 Aufl. Leipzig 1900 [1 Aufl. 1864] x. 267 pages. I have used also the two large biographies of Melanchthon, the exhaustive work of C. Schmidt, Elberfeld, 1861, which is still very valuable, and the more interesting book by Ellinger, Berlin, 1902. The English reader has the fine Lives by Stump, Reading, Pa., 1896, and by the late lamented Dr. Richard, New York, 1898, whose articles in this "Quarterly" were among the most notable that ever appeared in a theological periodical. Melanchthon's "Loci" has never been translated into English, though translations of several important passages are given in my articles in this "Quarterly," April 1916, and January 1917.



Christian knowledge is this, to know what the law demands, whence you get the strength to fulfill the law, whence you seek the forgiveness of sin, how you may strengthen the fainting soul against the demon, the flesh and the world, how you may console the afflicted conscience. Do the scholastics teach these things? Paul in the Epistle to the Romans, when he writes a compendium of Christian doctrine,—does he philosophize over the mysteries of the trinity, mode of incarnation, creation active or creation passive? What does he treat of? Why, of course concerning law, sin, grace, on which topics alone hang our knowledge of Christ. So many times Paul testifies that he wishes for believers the full knowledge of Christ. For he saw beforehand that we were to turn souls from those healthful topics to cold disputations foreign to Christ. Therefore we want to sketch a system of those places (fundamental points) which shall bring Christ near to thee, strengthen the conscience, and hold up the soul against Satan.<sup>2</sup>

Melanchthon treats first whether man is able to attain good from himself alone. The answer is, no. Then the will would be free, but it is not. (Notice in this first edition of the *Loci* the tremendous influence of Luther). The understanding does not guide the desires, but these are ruled by natural impulses, such as love and anger. The will is subject not to the reason but to dark impulses. Besides there is another element, the Divine predestination. Therefore a self-determining will in man is excluded. It is only a wheel in the system of the all-working of God.

Therefore man is capable of good only as long as the spirit of God rests upon him. But he has lost this by the fall. Self love now rules him. Sin constitutes his proper being, and so his works must be sinful. Even if a deed seems to be good, its root is still sin and self love. So it is impossible that a man can win merit, that he can feel true unselfish love to God. Even his penitence is sinful,

2 "Loci Communes," ed. Plitt-Kolde, pp. 63-64.

as it proceeds from his corrupted nature, The beginning of true penitence is not in the hand of man, but is worked by the Holy Spirit.

The means which God uses for this purpose is the law, that is, the sum of all moral commandments, brought to us by the Old Testament, the New Testament, or by natural law planted in us. In order to become better a man must understand his sinful condition. The law does this. It makes him conscious of his fearful corruption. It places the highest demands upon him, and when he makes the attempt to fulfill them he finds his moral powers are insufficient. This conviction drives him even deeper into sin and must lead him to despair, if God had not after discovery of the sickness also shown the remedy.

This remedy is the Gospel. As the law is not simply in the Old Testament but in the New as well, so is also the Gospel. It embraces all the gracious promises of God, and shows itself most directly in Christ. He has not only given a new law and summed up the old, but he is the guarantee of the forgiveness of sin and therefore the bringer of a new God-filled life. The Gospel is the promise of grace, the mercy of God, the forgiveness of sins and the witness of the good feeling of God to us.

How do we get all this? In justification.

"We are justified (says Melanchthon), when, after having been dead through the law we are made alive again by the promised word of grace or by the forgiving Gospel, hang on the promise in faith, and do not doubt that Christ's righteousness is our righteousness, that the sacrificial work of Christ is propitiation for us, that Christ's resurrection is also ours; in other words, that our sins are forgiven, and God is gracious to us."

The presupposition of justification is faith. This is not to be understood with the scholastics as a consent to the teachings of the Church. Such a faith reduces the life-giving power to a mere illusion, an historical knowledge, in which there does not dwell justifying force. Faith is trust in God's mercy. This is of course stimulated by the love of God toward us, as the Scripture shows

it, by the coming of Christ and His sacrifice which have won for man the grace of God. But only when this knowledge becomes an inner experience and works within a firm trust in God, is justifying grace there. Then God's Spirit comes into our hearts. The effect which this has is that the justified man now does works pleasing to God. But even these are not meritorious. It is only because they are done in faith that they are not looked upon as sinful before God. But faith whose first fruit love and hope are, makes the believer firm in the conviction that he is in grace. The genuineness of faith is shown in this that it awakens in the hearts of men love to God and the neighbour. In the grace of the Gospel law is done away, even the moral law. But does that mean freedom to sin? No. Free from the curse of the law, we are no longer under the rule of sin; from slaves we became children; renewed through the Spirit of Christ we fulfill the works of the law without the law. "The Holy Spirit is nothing else than the living will of God" so that when we have him we do spontaneously what he requires. While therefore the law can no longer condemn those who are in Christ, while these are impelled by the Spirit to the fulfilling of the law, they are free from the decalogue; its will, that is the Spirit, is Himself to them the living law. In this life this freedom is indeed imperfect, because holiness is not yet perfect. There are always two men in every Christian, the old and the new. But when the Christian sins, he trusts that God forgives him and that the law will no longer punish him. Holiness is begun; mortal sins, which draw damnation down, the Christian commits no more. But for his daily sins he hopes for the promised forgiveness.

But justifying power springs only from faith; the sacraments do not possess it. They are signs instituted by God which meet human weakness. They make sure to the doubtful the grace offered by God and impart rich consolation to the despairing.

There are only two sacraments. 1. Baptism. It secures forgiveness of sins and enables one to press on from

the horrors of the feeling of sin to a comforting consciousness of the grace of God. As penitence (penance) consists in this change from death by the law to new life by the Gospel, a special sacrament of penance is not necessary, it is only a repetition of baptism. Of course this repetition is continued through the whole life. When man is taken hold of by a true penitence proceeding from a deep contrition, he will feel his need to confess his sins. That is done in Confession. Private confession is only a human institution but it is of great use. But absolution is indispensable, because by it man applies to himself the universally given promise. But the satisfactions demanded by the Roman Catholic Church are rejected. There is no satisfaction to be rendered to the justice of God except the death of Christ.

2. The Lord's Supper is no sacrifice, but only a sign of grace instituted for the consolation of the doubting conscience. The significance of the sacrament is to make us firm in faith, as we are often weak and doubt concerning grace. As this doubt often comes as we near death, the dying are to be comforted by the sacrament. Outside of this, what is called sacrament has no right to the name. Especially ordination of priests. For there is no such thing as a priest. All Christians are priests.

In regard to worldly authority, it is instituted by God, and it is absolutely necessary to obey it, even when it is wrong. One can withdraw himself from tyranny without uproar. But bishops or spiritual authorities are to be followed only so far as they agree with Scripture. If temporal or spiritual authorities command anything against faith, they are not to be obeyed. As to things which are indifferent, that is, things not commanded upon all, such as marriage, what we eat, etc., the Christian must have freedom, though having regard to the weak. We must keep the free preaching of the Gospel, whatever they do against us.

If ever there was a book which showed the overwhelming influence of a man other than the author, that book was the first edition of Melancthon's *Loci*. We are re-

minded of the perplexed confession of poor dying Isaac: The voice is Jacob's voice, but the hands are the hands of Esau (Gen. 27:22). They were Melanchthon's hands, but the voice that sounded through the book was that of Luther. I do not mean by that that Luther controlled the writing of the book in any way. He did not. Melanchthon spoke as he believed, but what he believed he got directly or indirectly from Luther. It is said that Luther's Commentary on Galatians (1519, to be distinguished from the larger commentary on the same book of 1535) exercised special influence in this book. Melanchthon thought this Commentary was a priceless possession. "You have Martin's *Galatians*," he wrote to a friend in April 1520. "It will serve as Theseus thread by which you can follow safely in the labyrinth of these studies." It was because Luther followed Paul that Melanchthon followed Luther. Melanchthon's book has the stamp of freshness and immediateness too much to think that Luther dictated the book. As Ellinger says:

"Through Melanchthon's remarks we can trace the joy with which in Paul's teachings he discovered the pure fountain of Christianity; and Paul's Epistles as well as all of the Scripture Melanchthon had worked over independently, and in small matters even took a different view from Luther, as for instance his attempt to harmonize James and Paul on faith. But it was natural that his penetration into Paul's doctrine would have been effected under the influence of the thoughts, the personality, and the writings of Luther; and Melanchthon's ability to live into a circle of ideas strange yet agreeable, and to make them his own, must have united into an indissoluble whole the results of his own Scripture study with the impulses received from Luther. Therefore he was especially competent to perform the task he undertook in this book."<sup>3</sup>

In his pamphlet on Melanchthon published as a part of Melanchthon's jubilee of 1897, Harnack says that it is perhaps unexampled in history that a man of the capabil-

3 Philipp Melanchthon, Berl. 1902, 138.

ities of Melanchthon ever made himself so fully the organ of another. Luther's personality ruled him so that everything of his own seems melted. Only the form, the clear, natural flowing exposition belongs to the great pupil. He had to create a new form of theological discussion. The single Melanchthon did in the 16th century what it took a proud series of teachers to do in the 12th and 13th from Peter to Lombard to Duns Scotus. But that was ordered after a monkish fashion or point of view. The ban of the Church lay on all secular acts. But in Melanchthon the worship of God and worldly calling were united in the ethical. New tasks were placed before the moral movement of life. He saved Protestantism for Scripture and Scripture for Protestantism, a permanent building on Christian Humanism. That Humanism, says Harnack, deepened and enriched, is still to-day the power of our higher life, and its sword will always blaze out when it is necessary to vindicate the inheritance of history, to protect the nobility of the spirit and the purity of the soul.<sup>4</sup>

You have noticed the Luther-like doctrine of predestination and of the unfree will which Melanchthon sets forth in this book. Let me quote on this Dr. Carl Schmidt in his great *Life of Melanchthon*:

"Most striking is the way in which predestination and the absolute divine necessity of everything that happens is expressed, and how even after the new birth works cannot be looked upon as good. This exaggeration is found in all theologies of the time of the Reformation. It belongs to those doctrines which Luther most firmly held on to. It was not simply the result of a logical system which issued from a one-sided conception of God and, developed with unbending strictness, ended with the sacrifice of the human will. The doctrine of predestination was rooted in the innermost grounds of evangelical piety. Over against work holiness and the superficial Pelagian Church doctrine, the Reformers felt themselves com-

4 Harnack, "Reden u. Aufsätze," Giessen 1904, i. 171ff.

pelled to humble man again, to lead him back to a consciousness of the nothingness of his works, upon which the merit of Christ can alone become glorified. But it is to be noticed with Melanchthon that he emphasizes more the predestination to salvation, the election, rather than reprobation. Although of course reprobation must follow necessarily from the idea that the will of God is the only and immediate cause of everything. To be sure the reference to the redemption fulfilled in Christ and the Holy Scripture which witnesses it, the frequent insisting on the believing acceptance of the divine promise, do away in a measure in Melanchthon with the worst difficulties of the doctrine of predestination. There was an inner contradiction here in Melanchthon of which he was not conscious which led to further consequences."<sup>5</sup>

(He refers to Melanchthon's later leaving extreme predestination. As to the end and aim of the *Loci*, I quote Schmidt again):

"Melanchthon passed over the ordinary pieces of Catholic orthodoxy not because he did not hold them as Scriptural or important, but because he wanted to satisfy the longings for salvation neglected by Catholicism, to free men from the authority of Church and schools, and to lead them to Christ who promises alone grace, consolation and rest. Consequently Christianity is not simply knowledge but a new life principle which transforms men. He says this again in the closing words of his book: 'The Kingdom of God is not in word, but in power and virtue, in inner being and life.' Therefore preachers should preach this and theologians teach it. In this way in this little book Melanchthon had pointed the way to the Reformation, and did it inestimable service. Everyone could now see what kind of a theology it was which Jerome Emser called cynic, and which the Paris theologians had given out for a formless mixture of contradictory heresies."<sup>6</sup>

<sup>5</sup> "Philip Melanchthon: Leben u ausgewählte Schriften," Elberfeld 1861, pp. 72-3.

<sup>6</sup> Schmidt: *ib.* pp. 73-4.



Melanchthon's *Loci* aroused extraordinary interest in Germany and Switzerland. It was printed twice in Wittenberg and once in Basel in 1521, and in following years in Augsburg, Strassburg, and Hagemau. There were seventeen editions between 1521 and 1525, and Spalatin's German translation was also repeatedly reprinted. In December 1521 a Wittenberg student brought a copy to Strassburg, which made Nicholas Gerbel, a jurist there, write:

"This young fellow has told me wonderful things from Wittenberg. He has showed me a college note-book of Melanchthon's lectures on Paul and Matthew, and especially his *Loci*, a divine book, which in my opinion no one can overlook without the greatest loss. It has taken hold of me so deeply that day and night I can think of nothing but Wittenberg."

The Augsburg printer, Sigismund Grimm, in his edition of 1524 placed a picture of Hercules strangling Cerberus with the words, "The Conqueror of the Monster." Luther's famous words are: *Liber invictus, non solum immortalitate sed et canone ecclesiastico dignus.*<sup>7</sup> No small soul could have written that. And in his Table Talk: "Among all the books of Philip you find none where the whole Theology is so finely set out; read all Church Fathers and scholastics, and they are nothing in comparison." He says again:

"Read the *Loci* of Philip along with the Bible. It is the first book, wherein the true theology is brought together quietly and orderly. Augustine, Ambrose, Bernhard, Bonaventure, Lyra, Gabriel Biel, Staupitz and others have much good; our Master Philip can explain the Scripture, weigh matters, and put them together finely and concisely. He has learned by Cross and Attack to pray, and settled matters with the greatest and most learned opponents, and he is in earnest with his theology.<sup>8</sup> (And again): "He who will become a theologian now has

7 "De Servo Arbitrio," in Opp. Lat. var. Arg. 7, 117.

8 Mathesius, quoted by Schmidt, p. 303 (also in part on his title page).

a great advantage in having the German Bible. That is so clear that he can read it without any hindrance. Then let him read Melanchthon's *Commonplaces* (*Loci*) industriously and thoroughly until he has mastered it. When he has read these two books he will be a theologian whom neither the devil nor any heretic can shake, and all divinity lies open to him to read what he likes with edification. If he cares to he can read my commentaries on Romans, Galatians and Deuteronomy, which will give him eloquence and a copious vocabulary. But you will find no book under the sun in which the whole of theology is so well summed up as in the *Commonplaces*. Read all the fathers and commentators on the Canon Law—they are nothing! There is no better book than this of Melanchthon's except Scripture. He is more concise than I; he argues and instructs; I am garrulous and rhetorical. If people follow my advice they will only print my doctrinal books, though indeed they may read the others for history to see how things went, for at first it was not so easy as it now is. . . . Philip has written good books, and no one will write better on penance. And the commentaries on Romans and Colossians, and the *Commonplaces*, those are divine books, and the (Augsburg) Confession and the Apology! Ah, how fine it is to study now, as compared with former times!"<sup>9</sup>

Catholic scholars did not however at once get hold of the tremendous importance of Melanchthon's book. It was not until 1525 that Dr. Eck published Catholic *Loci* against it. In 1531 Cochlaeus, a passionate opponent of the Reformation, wrote against it. He called it a new Koran, much more dangerous than Luther's writings, for Melanchthon's way of writing is more engaging, his temper nobler, the way he handles the Bible more skillful and careful. "O unhappy Germany," he called out, "if this dangerous monster, this tempting siren, is not soon abolished from the earth." He cries to Melanchthon: "If I had the only copy of your book that there was, I

9 Preserved Smith and Gallinger, "Conversations with Luther," 1915, pp. 178-9, 204.

would consider it the greatest honor to throw it into the fire in order to purify the earth of this pest." Oh yes, Cochlaeus, no doubt you would have done that. That was the way your Church had of getting rid of books and their authors which refuted your errors. But for a part of the world at least that day was now past.

In 1535 there appeared an entirely new and worked over edition of the *Loci*, with many additions. Of this new edition six other editions appeared up to 1541, and six reprints in different places, as well as a new German translation by Justus Jones in 1536. It was dedicated to Henry VIII of England, in which he summoned that King to do something for the Reformation. He also says that he wishes to set forth the only "Doctrine of the Catholic Church of Christ," that is the teaching of Scripture and of Church writers universally acknowledged as orthodox. In the later editions still, after Henry VIII had begun his brutal persecutions of the Protestants, he omitted all mention of that King, whom he justly calls in one of his letters the "English Nero," and dedicated his book simply to the "pious reader." He urges the student to turn from the scholastics to the Bible and try to attain love of truth and unanimity with the pious, the two virtues on which the salvation of the Church depends. Another edition appeared in 1543 and another in 1559, the year before Melanchthon passed out of this troubled life. These editions were greatly enlarged on the old topics with treatment of new ones, and with significant changes of views. These changes were in the direction of more moderate, more Protestant, more Biblical views, less High Calvinism on Predestination, more spiritual on baptism and Lord's Supper, and while maintaining the general ground-work of his theology showing a healthy growth into larger truth.

The *Loci* was the first book of Protestant systematic theology, first in time, and first in importance till the appearance of Calvin's *Institutio Christiana* in 1536. Both were the work of young men. Melanchthon was 24 and Calvin was 27. Were men more precocious then? Both

were amazing accomplishments for men so young, written with the maturity and wisdom of age! Ideas that had been scattered here and there in writings of Luther and Melancthon were now set forth in ordered and scientific form. The *Loci* gave intellectual standing-ground for the Reformation. It showed that clearness, lucidity, strength, consistency, were elements of Protestant theology, and that opponents could not laugh it out of court as a heap of heresies. The book has a prominent place in the intellectual history of Europe, and especially of Germany, and is at the same time a testimony to the organizing and constructive power of the quiet scholar of Wittenberg. Woe to that Church which can produce no work in systematic divinity, whose theological views are in flux or in the air. The Church is founded on a rock, said Christ. Is it founded on anything except truth, and on Him who is the Truth? Then there must be something permanent, something firm and solid in the doctrinal heritage which we have received from Christ and the Apostles. What it is is the task of systematic theology to find out and set forth and prove,—prove from Scripture, reason, experience, philosophy, science, communion with men, with books and with God. I do not say which is the most important of the theological disciplines, but if any is more important than systematic theology, that one must show surprisingly clear credentials. The prejudice in some quarters against systematic theology is as unscientific as it is short-sighted and shallow. The Reformation was tremendously helped by the *Loci*. It gave it an intellectual standing ground and appeal to earnest thinkers in all lands, and without that ground and appeal no movement can win permanent success. If it does, its very success—like that of Mormonism and Christian Science—is its failure and its shame.

*Drew Theological Seminary,  
Madison, N. J.*

## ARTICLE IV.

## THE ALLEGED "HISTORIC EPISCOPATE."

BY PROFESSOR DAVID H. BAUSLIN.

The real unity of the Church on earth is discoverable only in that unity that is spiritual, in that unity which creates the inward and the only real life of the Church. If the history of movements conducted in behalf of this desirable kind of unity has any lesson to teach that is plain and manifest, it is this, that all those that are in any way mechanical or even institutional are hopeless, from the start, and doomed to ultimate failure.

Another fact seems to be also equally well attested that unity upon the basis of an episcopate, that is either "historical" or confessedly unhistorical, whether we regard the Scriptures on the one hand or the principles offered in the present state of the Church or the age on the other is equally hopeless.

The Church can only be genuinely and permanently unified by that which really unites the souls of men and that is found only in that Word of the Living God which works in men the peaceable fruits of righteousness, and that because it effects in them spiritual regeneration, moral reconciliation and a progressive sanctification. That and that alone is the effective spiritual agency which must gather and merge the sects and Churches into the one great and comprehensive Church which is "the congregation of the saints in which the Gospel is properly taught and the sacraments rightfully administered," and which is co-ordinate with the kingdom of God among men. No union that is produced by schemes or by some merely strategic coalition of churches will ever prove to be permanent. To bring that achievement to pass there must be some pervasive creative power that is capable of binding the churches into one temple.

Within the Church there are varieties of gifts and di-

versities of administration, some being called to be prophets, some pastors, some evangelists, but in all this variety and diversity there is to be found no warrant for any hierarchy of prerogative. There always have been in the administration of the Church's affairs instances of personal moral superiority and spiritual leadership but no gradation of official rank and distinction.

The Holy Ghost on the day of Pentecost came upon all of the disciples and the power of the keys was placed in the possession of the apostles, representing the Church, and not in the hands of Peter only, who is alleged to have been appointed by Jesus as His successor and head of the Church, who is further credited with having founded the Church in the imperial city of Rome, where he died as a martyr after having labored there for a period of twenty-five years. In behalf of Peter it is further claimed that he transmitted his primacy and leadership to the bishop of Rome whom he in turn appointed as his successor, and who in turn transferred it to succeeding popes. From these and other false premises it is claimed that the Church of Rome is the only true Church possessing a true and legitimate ministry, and that all of the contentions put forth in behalf of these and other monstrous pretensions are conclusively proved from the Bible the Church Fathers, tradition and monuments.

Others making less advanced claims maintain that Jesus turned His Church over to all of His apostles and that upon their death they transmitted their leadership to succeeding bishops to whom apostolic power and authority have also been transmitted and that such bishops and their successors as have been appointed by apostles other than Peter, have just as much power and authority as the Bishop of Rome, and that these claims are supported by adequate proofs found in history the Church Fathers and the Scriptures. The Roman Catholic, the Anglican and the Episcopal Church in America each claims such succession for its priests as that contemplated in the above stated theories of the Church and the ministry. The Roman Church does not recognize

the claims of the Anglican and the American Episcopal Churches, while on the other hand the Episcopal Church does not recognize the ministry of other Protestant Churches as episcopally ordained and therefore as not belonging to the legitimate ministry of the Church.

In opposition to all such unscriptural, unhistorical and unwarranted ecclesiastical claims, it should be affirmed that in the early days of Christianity nothing was known of a "Prince of Apostles," nor of any vicar of Christ, any viceregent of God or any monarchical bishop. The change of Peter's name from Simon to Peter, "the rock-like man," does not carry with it any special significance, while the commission to "bind" and "loose" and the promise connected with that commission were not intended exclusively for Peter, but for all the apostles, he standing only for a type.

It may be freely granted that Peter was a primate among men, and that in all the lists of the apostles his name occupies the first place. Certainly no one who studies the life of the great apostle as a whole, notwithstanding the fact that his position was accompanied with grievous falls and shortcomings, can doubt that he fully deserved his high place as the chief apostle, that he was veritably a *primus inter pares*.

Of the great chieftain in the apostolic band Origen has said in the well-known comment and estimate, "He who has Peter's faith is the Church's rock; he who has Peter's virtues has Peter's keys." But notwithstanding all that may be set down to the credit and praise of the apostle, this is unquestionable that Peter himself never mentioned his primacy in his speeches and writings and nowhere else in the New Testament is it distinctly stated or recognized by others whatever may have been his natural endowments, or his recognized capacity for leadership. Peter was never accorded any official primacy by the real Lord and Head of the Church, nor are there any proofs that he ever assumed any. He had the primacy of an impulsive, able and aggressive character, of a man prompt to speak and act, but there is no secure ground in either Scripture



or history upon which the so-called "Petrine theory," with its sweeping claims, may rest with any security.

Christ did not found a Church here and another there but He established the Church upon the one true foundation of the apostles, He Himself being according to the Scriptures, the chief corner-stone. Those post-apostolic developments in the Church, which have culminated in the Roman usurpations have sprung from the fact that the Church had been separated from that one true foundation and builded upon the traditions of men. To all believers, whether they were at Rome, Antioch, Jerusalem, or in the desert places of the earth, the Lord promised equally His presence, and that exalted possession would have continued with them even if Rome, Antioch or Jerusalem had passed from the earth in some cataclysm of nature, or had the alleged succession of bishops, been broken for some hundreds of years. Whatever interpretation may be given to Matthew 16:18, this is now unquestionable, that what was given to Peter was conferred upon his person and not because of any official rank, nor upon his successors as such.

It has even been questioned, but as it seems to the writer without good grounds, whether Peter ever was in Rome. It matters not whether he was ever there or had ever founded a Church in the imperial city, or even had passed the bishopric on to some successor. This again is unquestionable, that with the rising autocracy in the Church and the growth of hierarchical pretensions and leadership, there entered into the life of the Church one powerful cause of that deplorable declension and deadness which soon came upon it and caused its candlestick to have been well-nigh removed.

Our Episcopalian friends, with most of whom the belief in what is alleged to be an "Historic Episcopate" in which an unbroken line of succession in the priesthood from the apostles down is a cherished and sincerely believed doctrine of the ministry, seem strangely unable to understand the reason why Lutherans, Presbyterians and others, do not appreciate more highly their frequent, and

no doubt, intended to be generous offers to share with other Churches their "deposited treasure of the historic episcopate." This indifference of people who are strongly attached to historical Protestant positions is sometimes attributed to a hard and stubborn conservatism once expressed by that sturdy Puritan divine, Cotton Mather, who, in speaking of men who insist upon the necessity of Episcopal ordination, as a necessity to the maintenance of a valid ministry, said, "These men strengthen the common energy in the boundless mischief attempted by this foolish cavil. To maintain their episcopal ordination they set up that vile, senseless, wretched whimsy of an uninterrupted succession, which our glorious Lord has confuted with such matters of fact, that it is amazing the builders of Babel are not ashamed of it; and they will have none owned for ministers of Christ in the world, but such as antichrist has ordained for him."

To Lutherans in this country, with their thoroughly democratic conceptions of the Church and its ministry, to Presbyterians, with perhaps Scotch stubborn antecedents, Congregationalists whose memories hark back to the days of King James and Archbishop Laud, and to others the term "bishop," it must be confessed makes a doubtful appeal. But if even these were approached on the line of the practical utility of the episcopate, as an office simply, and its convenience as a method of administration, they would likely be more interested. But telling Lutherans and other good people who have both history and convictions, that the Lord Jesus Christ Himself instituted the episcopate and is not pleased to-day with any Church that has not such a form of organization, is not conducive to quickened interest. To the ears of such people nothing sounds more impossible than that, for according to their ideas, Christ, the real Head of the Church, never could have given an instant's care to orders and dignities, ceremonies and formalities, among His disciples. And to them it is further incredible to imagine that even now He cares how His Church is organized, here on earth, so long as it maintains a vital, spiritual connection

with Him its living Lord and Head. Such Christians might be disposed to make some compromises of administration in order to get into unification with other Christians, but they are certainly unconvinced and unwilling to go on record before the world as believing that Jesus Christ will give more grace to, or dispense more grace through a bishop than to or through an humblest pastor of the flock of Christ, who is devoted to his Lord's mission and successful in winning men to Him. Lutherans and others have not so learned Christ and they are sure that from the Scriptures they have not learned that God is a respecter of persons and orders in the Church, and accordingly must continue to decline to go into any union on a basis which assumes that He does preferentially respect bishops who claim to stand in an unbroken succession reaching back to the days of the apostles.

Doubtless there is a truth, a great and momentous truth not to be disregarded, in the conception of historical continuity or succession that is scriptural. The Church is a vital organism with a continued life even the life of God. It has a corporate unity that places us in immediate and living connection with the apostles, saints, martyrs and preachers of all ages. That conception of unity and continuity links us with things that are venerable and makes us participants in the history of the long line of the great and good in the vast company of religious teachers and leaders who have wrought in fidelity and unselfishness in their own time and place. By one of the greatest among American religious leaders it has been said "That a Church out of connection with its past is impossible, and a Church that has lost the sense of its connection, regarding itself as being historically new is a Church chilled and benumbed by the fictitious isolation it assumes." But this does not imply that the vital unity of the Church is constructed upon the basis of any official and artificial succession of ministers for church rulers, but very much to the contrary.

In 1886 the House of Bishops of the Protestant Episcopal Church in this country set forth four principles as a

condition of union with other Protestant Churches. The Lambeth Conference of English Bishops two years later adopted similar conditions. The fourth principle of the condition of unity set forth and adopted by both houses was the acceptance of the Historic Episcopate, by which was signified a recognition of the absolute necessity of carefully derived Episcopal ordination to the validity of all ministerial functions in the Christian Church. Without this particular species of ordination there could be no true ministry and by implication no true Church; for where there is no true ministry there are no true sacraments, and a Church without the sacraments is no true Church at all.

The discussions and efforts at unification since 1886 that have ensued in succession, have made it plain with an unmistakable plainness, that insistence upon this dogma of the historic episcopate, which is but another phrase for the apostolical succession, has proven to be the most obstinate impediment to the bringing about of a comprehensive Church. A Church that arrogates to itself the indefensible distinction of being the only Church with a valid ministry, which has gathered round that office unscriptural claims and interwoven it with priestly functions, which seems to be more enamored of Anglicanism than Americanism, holds no vantage ground in calling upon other people to forsake their points of distinction in behalf of a comprehensive ecclesiastical unity.

The bearing of such a claim on the matter of Christian unity is easily seen. Protestant Churches that are doing the Lord's work effectively can hardly any longer entertain proposals of union which assume that their ministry is unauthorized. Even generous proposals of certain good and kindly-intentioned writers who give assurances that the Episcopal bishops could ordain all the ministers of other Churches at one time, thus admitting them into the real ministry, does not relieve the situation. Even if they should be brought to believe in an "historic episcopate," they should likely stumble at the acceptance of an "apostolic succession," the Lutheran claim to an unbroken

line in which is just as good as that of Episcopalians, themselves being the judges.

We are reminded that this view of the ministry is not presented as a mere academic thesis. It is proclaimed in sermons, advocated in books and pamphlets, circulated in tracts and reasons are constantly urged why the members of other Protestant communions should abandon their time-honored positions and come over to the more favored view. It may be said that all other Protestants also are glad to confess and affirm any points of contact and any common ground upon which they may stand with people who hold to such views. With them we are glad to confess that the Church is of divine origin, its divine prerogatives and its supreme pre-eminence as God's appointed instrument for the administration of the means of grace and the conversion of the world. With such Christians we are glad to hold to the belief in an "invisible Church," and the "communion of saints," as present realities; that the Church invisible is made one by the invisible bonds of faith and love and that the visible Church is made effective by its organization, "under some certain and definite form of government." In these and all other points of agreement that are fundamental all good people will rejoice and confess gladly that all alike are resting upon the one sure foundation of the prophets and apostles. But when the suggestion is made that the unity, and an artificial unity of Protestantism at that, involves a demand that the pastors of non-Episcopal Churches shall confess their lack of true ordination and shall submit to receive another ordination at the hands of the bishops of a more favored Church, many will be led to smile upon all who are laboring for this consummation as amiable enthusiasts chasing a vanishing rainbow, or striving to give substance to an iridescent dream. The fact is that there is no other doctrine which has served more effectively for the undoing of Christian unity than this doctrine of the "Historic Episcopate" linked as it always is with the unwarranted idea of an "apostolical succession," none that has proven more mischief making in

the past and none on which Christians are less likely to agree.

To an increasingly large number of people of both piety and attainments to keep on insisting upon such a theory as a necessary plank, in a platform for church unity is both irritating and futile. It has been invalidated by Biblical criticism, exegesis and history, until it is now conceded by the majority of Anglican scholars themselves, such men as Hatch, Lightfoot and others that the terms bishop and presbyter in the New Testament are used interchangeably and that neither in the Book of the Acts or any of the epistles of the New Testament is there any such thing insisted upon, as a mark of the Church or the ministry, as diocesan bishop or an "apostolical succession." Arguments once relied upon to establish such views are now seen to be only surmises and conjectures, and it is conceded that that man is the real successor of the apostles who has the spirit of an apostle and who does the work of an apostle, while the man who keeps on insisting that an acceptance of any such theory is a condition of union shows that he has not enough of the spirit of discernment to read aright the sign of the times. This is as certain as the law of gravitation that men in all lands, whose orders are alleged to be invalid, and whose ordination is rated as no ordination at all are not inferior in character, success or usefulness to such as claim exceptional prerogatives that have been transmitted to them through the laid on hands of an alleged successor of the apostles.

It is always to be remembered that it is not the view that a bishop may be for the well-being of the Church to which so many strong and powerful Protestant bodies are opposed but the pretentious theory that without a particular type of bishop the Church becomes the fostering mother of schism in the body of Christ and that some of the channels of grace are closed. Those who insist upon such theories are frequently fine and sincere Christian people. They are courteous and mean to be obliging, but manifesting good will by proposals not to recognize the

ministry of other Churches but only to extend to it the benefits of coming into the apostolical succession, is only to ask for capitulation. The Rev. Dr. Charles E. Jefferson, in one of his incisive papers has summed it all up in these words: "The Anglican Church has never yet made an offer of union to the other church bodies, nor has her daughter, the Episcopal Church in the United States, which is not an invitation to surrender. This should be clearly understood by all who would discuss intelligently the question of Church union... The Episcopal Church is willing to deal generously with other denominations, provided that all their ministers will come round and accept ordination by a bishop's hands. And this is the very thing which the ministers of other denominations will never consent to do. There is no more likelihood of their doing this than there is of their accepting the doctrine of Papal Infallibility or the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception of the Virgin Mary."

The entire reasonableness of this statement of Dr. Jefferson is admitted in these words of the late venerable and influential bishop Doane, of Albany, New York, who says: "To approach the great Protestant Churches of the world with the statement that their ministers are unlawful, is to propose not reunion but absorption; not consideration, but contempt. If one may quote, not irreverently, the vulgar saying of the lamb and the lion lying down together with the lamb inside, it is just this and nothing more, and leaves us in an attitude of antagonism and isolation, which is perfectly hopeless and futile." Bishop Doane also quotes with approval a suggestion made by Dr. Palmer, the Anglican bishop of Bombay, that this whole question of "the origin of episcopacy should be reopened for discussion in an impartial spirit." He calls for "a dispassionate, scientific, scholarly statement of the whole subject."

In actions of but recent date the House of Bishops of the Protestant Episcopal Church, has indicated again in unmistakable terms, the unchanged attitude on church unity. The bishops had been appealed to in behalf of a



movement to place the relations of the Churches on a more cordial and effective basis of co-operation during the period of the war. Would it not be possible, they were asked, to give a collective authority to some, at least, of the army chaplains, which would at once relieve the consciences of some among those to whom they were called, to minister and testify to the "essential unity" of those who bear the name of Christ and are called to be His witnesses. But again the same old obstacles growing out of this theory of the episcopate, loomed large and the bishops answered, no. Their precedents had become inhibitious. These leaders of the Episcopal Church, in consistency with previous deliverances, chose the way of deliberate and indiscriminate discouragement.

Another discussion of the same House of Bishops concerned the conditions of worship and work together of certain Christians in the same locality. The permission asked of the House of Bishops referred to conditions which arose in a city in New Jersey, last winter through the coal shortage. The First and Second Reformed Churches, the First Presbyterian, and the Christ Protestant Episcopal Churches had been worshipping together on Sunday evenings. Out of that common experience of worship grew a spirit of fellowship which was unwilling to fall back into the condition of denominational aloofness which had previously existed. In their enthusiasm it was proposed by the pastors that the members of each separate Church should become members of all, the Episcopalans for instance, uniting with the Presbyterian and Reformed Churches, while retaining their membership in the Protestant Episcopal Church. It was suggested that the Protestant Episcopal House of Bishops might be willing to ordain one of the local ministers as a bishop according to their rules.

Certainly this was a somewhat anomalous request and the enthusiasm of those good people had no doubt run ahead of present possibilities. Again the answer of the bishops was discouraging, for they say: "No steps should be taken with regard to reunion in particular lo-

calities or between particular bodies which would hinder or endanger the wider object of the reunion of the whole body." "You must not move till we move all at once," the bishops tell us. The reply to the request for advice goes on to say: "That confirmation as the Apostolic conception of baptism cannot be surrendered or treated as an optional alternative to any other form of Reception to full Church fellowship."

In each of these decisions the bishops have something to say of coming conferences on reunion which must not be jeopardized by some previous action. But it is certainly reasonable to anticipate the outcome of such coming conferences if the Protestant Episcopal Church means to enter them with a demand upon all others for a complete surrender, such as is outlined in these two Episcopal decisions.

We think we can appreciate the difficulties which the Episcopal Church confronts. In view of the present day demands for some demonstrated and objective unity of Christians that body of Christians is in an uneasy place. It is not divided from other Churches by any natural line of cleavage. It is not like its mother communion in England which can claim to be a Church of the whole people and in which any baptized Englishman has a right to membership and to partake of the sacrament. That Church is in this land, a communion like any other in a free country and has a right to settle the terms of its membership according to its own laws. On the one side of the natural line of cleavage which runs across its life it seeks to relate itself to the Latin Church, which persistently, totally and scornfully denies the validity of its ordinations and sacraments. On the other hand where its whole hope of present fellowship remains, and where there is to be found any ground of hope for an acceptance of its theories and proposals, it is still kept back by its own scruples and insistence upon an artificial ministerial "succession" Continued efforts to mollify Rome and Petrograd are not helpful to hasten unity with other self-respecting bodies of Christians.

In these theories of an "Historical Episcopate" and an unbroken "apostolical succession," and associated principles we are always coming upon a rock of offense and it is time that it should be frankly so stated. The assurances given us that there is a "Holy Catholic Church" composed of the Greek Church, the Roman Church, the old Catholics and a few others and last, but not least, "*The Church*," and that all the rest of us are in mere voluntary religious organizations which are not Churches by and by becomes irritating. Such claims in print, look forbidding, and the time has come when this fact should be insisted upon.

About all the movements toward church unity have been made that are possible until it is settled by Christian people who have a fondness for an unbroken "succession" whether they are to regard the rest of us as Churches or not. It would be well for such Christians to disband every commission they have on the subject of Church unification until they settle this question of the classification of other equally good people. For ourselves we are fully persuaded of the utter futility of any and every effort in the future along that line until other Protestant communions than the Protestant Episcopal, are frankly, unambiguously and unmistakably acknowledged as Churches. To continue negotiations with this as an undecided question is barely courteous and certainly unfruitful.

We do not object to being called sects by people who call themselves sects, but we must be permitted to object to any name which the persons or organizations using it would count offensive if it were employed by us toward them with the same connection. We object to being called sects by any organization calling itself "*the Church*." It inspires within us the feeling that we suspect animated the Virginian in Mr. Owen Wister's book who, when he was called an opprobrious and suggestive name, responded with a gentle but decidedly ominous look that had a pistol shot behind it, with these few words, "When you call me that again smile."

We have certainly come to the parting of the ways on

this matter of proposals for Church unity upon bases that are purely external. Whenever any good Episcopalian, of the more moderate order talks of treating with other Protestants upon a basis of comity, he at once encounters the constant threat of the "High Church" party about the "disruption of the Church" if any such thing is persisted in. The time past has certainly sufficed to make it evident whether, when Lutherans, Presbyterians, Baptists, Congregationalists and others are invited to a feast, they are to sit in the parlor with their Episcopal hosts, or to eat with the heathen and outcast in the kitchen. That matter can be settled only by the people who issue the invitation and by placing an unambiguous statement in the invitation. All efforts at a union to be brought about upon the basis in which the doctrine of the "apostolic succession" is insisted upon and the ordination and the sacraments of other Churches are unrecognized as valid, are foreordained to failure. It is preposterous to further think of a union of Churches with a super-church instead of a union of equal Churches upon the basis of a common faith. "Of all dangerous mental habits," says Huxley, "that which school boys call cocksureness is probably the most perilous."

The feeling of absolute certainty of the science of divine things, as applied to the administration of the Church in solving a delicate and difficult problem has continued now for a generation to be the main barrier to the realization of contemplated ideals of Church unity.

That any modification of these external conditions of unity is to be expected, does not appear among the religious forecasts for the future. The influential Episcopal note indicates no change of front on the "Episcopate" or the "succession." In an address made by the Right Reverend Dr. Carmichael, Bishop Coadjutor of Montreal, and delivered before the Pan-American Conference of the Protestant Episcopal Church held in Washington, D. C., in 1903, the learned prelate seeks to show where the Methodists and Presbyterians agree with the Anglicans, and makes the plea that they should come back into the

Episcopal fold which he calls "the Church" and thus fulfill the prayer of our Lord, "That they all may be one." This is in entire harmony with similar deliverances of more recent date. In one of the approved publications of the Episcopal Church, under the caption of "The Church," we have found this: "The Church (Protestant Episcopal) in this country holds the key to Christian unity. She is the only Church large enough to admit all orthodox Christians within her fold. She is the most catholic-minded and catholic-hearted Church in the world. She has the undoubted apostolic succession. She holds the scriptural institutions—no more, no less. She administers valid and unmutilated sacraments. She speaks out boldly and clearly on the great social evils of the day. Her Christmas and Easter and Lent are borrowed by every sect that has any vitality. Her prayer book is more or less used by every educated minister of every denomination. Her marriage and burial services are conceded by intelligent outsiders to be the most beautiful services of their kind in the world. Let us magnify the dear Church to which we belong."

We blame no man for magnifying his Church which has been the cherishing mother of so much that is good in the best of men, but we must be permitted to stubbornly dissent from the exclusiveness of the above claims. We are able to conceive of a Church without a sacrificing priesthood with a necessary mechanical mode of transmitting sacerdotal functions.

One of the chief among the chieftains in behalf of Church unity is the distinguished Congregationalist, Dr. Newman Smyth. In season and out of season this able advocate of some common ground upon which Congregationalists might be recognized in the Episcopal fold, has given time and labor. But so far as the representatives of the dominant party among Episcopalians is concerned Dr. Smyth has been assured that nothing less than entire surrender will insure him welcome. The *Living Church*, "High Church" able organ, states the opinion of this large and aggressive section of the Episcopal body in a frank

and, on its own premises, logical handling of Dr. Smyth's proposals:

"What stands in the way of unity is simply that Congregational ministers are not priests, as each of them would testify, and as all are agreed—except in the sense of the lay priesthood of the entire Body. The fundamental question then arises: Do Congregational ministers desire to become priests? If they do, our bishops can certainly supply the necessary gift of orders, and we quite agree with Dr. Smyth that it would be feasible to arrange for conferring such orders 'in a form which would not require of [Congregationalists] a denial of [their] previous ordination vows.' . . . But do Congregational ministers desire to become priests? Unless they do, there can be, as we have shown, no object in asking for the laying of Episcopal hands. We cannot believe that either party would be willing to arrange for such an ordination without securing, in advance, an entire agreement upon what were involved in it. Congregational ministers must not be hoodwinked into being made priests against their will, on any vague plea that our Bishops are merely going through a vague form to which we attach importance, while they do not. One has no right to attach great importance to meaningless forms. The highest churchman among Catholics does not make of episcopacy a charm, which can make good whatever else may be lacking. Thus the real issue is not over the 'historic episcopate,' but over the historic priesthood. . . . Only a Church with Bishops can secure priests; but unless a Church wants priests, it might better steer clear of Bishops. The ultimate question between Churchmen and Protestants turns upon the priesthood."

Here again the question of priesthood is central. This is the answer of good and sincere people, who are unable to conceive of the Church without a sacrificing priesthood attainable only by the laying on of the hands of bishops. With them, priestly authority, being of the essence of the true Church of Christ, is something to be accepted without modification, subtraction or compromise. From peo-

ple holding other views, in equal sincerity, they are separated by the widest gulf that exists in the life of the Church on earth.

At a time, a few years ago, when Congregationalists in New Jersey, were showing a disposition to make some concessions and were ready to consider the question whether some form of diocesan episcopacy, which would not interfere with the independence of local Churches, might not be provided for and made acceptable to Independents, the *Church Standard* speaking for Episcopalians said:

"The Historic Episcopate is not a theory. It is an institution, perfectly recognizable throughout the history of the Church from certainly the second century to the present. That institution is an order of the Christian ministry possessed of at least one invariable characteristic, and continued from age to age and from generation to generation in one essentially unalterable way. It is that institution—not any theory whatsoever concerning its origin, its necessity or the consequences of its loss, but the historical institution itself, and with only its essentially historical characteristics—which the Lambeth platform sets forth as an indispensable condition of the restoration of Church unity. Our Congregational brethren, however, seem to regard the Historic Episcopate simply as an office which any body of Christians may lawfully create or abolish at pleasure, and which, if created, may be conferred by any persons and in any form that may happen at that time to be approved. Now, that view of the episcopate is by no means the historic view, nor would it restore the historic institution of the episcopate; and we submit to our Congregational brethren that, since they declare themselves to be 'willing to treat for unity' on the basis of an acceptance of the episcopate, and even of the diocesan episcopate, it would surely be no enormous step of advance if they should see their way to accept the historic order and institution, together with the historic office, of the episcopate."

There is about this something of that "happy indiffer-



ence" as this able paper, now no longer published, once affirmed about the phraseology of the famous Lambeth declaration concerning the Historic Episcopate. We do not understand exactly what its definition of the Historic Episcopate is, nor do we see how it can lay down a definition which shall begin with the "second century," and omit the apostolic Church, nor is it entirely clear how this Historic Episcopate is to be received by those who do not already have the cherished possession.

In addition to the foregoing let us adduce the words of Bishop Grafton about the recognition of ministers of other denominations:

"Let me," says the bishop, "restate the truth to which, in the interest of unity, I desire to bear witness. Within the body of Christ, where the apostolically descended and Episcopally ordained orders have been transmitted, there are to be found fuller sacramental endowments of grace than among our separated brethren. We are willing to allow their ministers to be what their convictions and their seals of God's approval testify them to be—viz., evangelists, teachers, preachers of the Word. But, realizing as we do the greater illuminations and resources and potentialities of grace given under the fuller administrations of the priesthood of Christ's body, which we by God's mercy possess, we desire them, so much more worthy as many of them are than ourselves, to be partakers of these spiritual gifts. Whenever our brethren are enabled by the enlightenment of God's Spirit to discern our priesthood, as now we acknowledge their ministry, the barriers to reunion will gradually melt away."

That is deliciously frank, stating explicitly what so many others have been saying implicitly.

It should be recalled also in this connection that a few years ago only, at one of the meetings of the Episcopal Church a preparatory report made by the committee "that, while for herself the Church has insisted in her own communion, on Episcopal ordination, she has nowhere declared that all other constituted ministry is null and void" was voted down. It was officially decided that the action

about to be taken was not to be construed "to indicate that the condition of the Historic Episcopate was to be interpreted liberally."

From the very first it has been increasingly clear that there was intended to be no concession to the non-Episcopally ordained branches of Christendom, in the offers of the Episcopal Church. And it has furthermore become increasingly manifest that there was no practical basis for church union in any such conceptions of Church and ministry, as are contemplated in such phraseology as "Historic Episcopate" and "apostolic succession." The language of one Episcopal bishop after another might be cited in addition to those already given. They settle our contention beyond controversy. Says Bishop Whipple:

"We believe that the ministry of the Primitive and Catholic Church is a threefold ministry of Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, and that it rests on the same proofs as the authenticity of the Scriptures and the Catholic faith."

Thus also writes Bishop De Wolf Harra:

"If the essentials could, in our conscientious judgment, have been at all comprehended in these first three conditions, we would have contented ourselves with a trilateral statement; but it is the faith of this Church that the Lord not only ordained two sacraments for the communion of His people, but also set apart certain orders of men for their administration, and provided for a succession of them from age to age. We can no more ignore the divine order of the Church than we can the 'sacred mysteries' intrusted to it, or the Sacred Scriptures, which contain the history of redemption."

And again Bishop Neely:

"It may as well be frankly said that a chief reason why 'Episcopal pulpits are locked against ministers of other Churches' is that, in the judgment of the Episcopal Church, such ministers are not duly commissioned, have not the Apostolic commission to minister the Word and Sacraments in the Church of Christ."

There can be no mistaking of the meaning of these

Episcopal deliverances. They give strong confirmation to words written years ago by that able and devout historian of the Church, the late Dr. Philip Schaff. In his last testimony on the question of church unity, in which he emphasized the services of the various communions of Christendom, from the Greek Church to the Salvation Army, Dr. Schaff said of the now famous Chicago Lambeth proposals for church union:

"The 'historic episcopate' is an insuperable stumbling-block to all non-Episcopalians, which will never be conceded by them as a condition of Church unity if it is understood to mean the necessity of three orders of the ministry and of episcopal ordination in unbroken historic succession. Christ says nothing about bishops any more than about patriarchs and popes, and does not prescribe any particular form of Church government. . . . 'Let us learn something from history. All respect for the historic episcopate. It goes back in unbroken lines almost to the beginning of the second century, and no one can dispute its historical necessity or measure of usefulness. But God has also signally blessed the Lutheran, the Presbyterian and the Congregational ministry for many generations, with every prospect of growing usefulness for the future; and what God has blessed no man should lightly esteem. The non-Episcopal Churches will never unchurch themselves, and will only negotiate on the basis of equality and a recognition of the validity of their ministry. Each denomination must offer its idol on the altar of reunion.'"

We do not ask Episcopalians to surrender anything which they hold to be true or for the well-being of the Church in its organization. We accord to them the right to fortify their tenets with every valid argument that may be adduced in their favor. We might wish that with them as for ourselves, they try to discriminate between that which is essential and that which is accidental in the life and organization of the Church. But we must insist upon reserving to ourselves the right to refuse to surrender what we regard as the fundamental principles of

Protestantism, and to continue to hold that those principles are unspeakably more valuable than any mere point of ecclesiastical order.

It is now thirty years since the overtures of the Lambeth Conference were first promulgated. During all these years there has been no conclusive evidence of any change of heart on the part of the commission that is pushing the desirability of a world conference of faith and order. There has been no authoritative declaration that the "four points"—the Bible, the creed, the sacraments and the historic episcopate—set forth by the Anglican bishops have been modified or amended. From all that can be learned it would seem that the body from which they emanated still regards them as "part of the sacred deposit committed to the Church and which cannot be compromised or surrendered." During the thirty years which have ensued since 1888, the futility of attempts at church unification on the basis of an acceptance of the theory of an "historic episcopate," as an ultimatum has been demonstrated time and again. Conscious of its weaknesses and imperfections the Evangelical Lutheran Church of our fathers, in no spirit of boasting or self-exaltation, but with humble and grateful loyalty to her Divine Head, must and will always insist that she is entitled to the name and prerogatives of a true Church of Christ, and that her ministry and sacraments are entitled to be regarded as genuine and valid. We are not ready to nullify and repudiate the Reformation and the fundamental principles upon which it rests.

The validity of the apostolical succession or its invalidity is to us a matter of indifference, whether the ordination of a minister of the Gospel is performed in pretended historical succession or not is of but little consequence to a Lutheran Christian. The pastor's calling is of God, through a congregation of God's people, and no human agency, no pope or bishop, has any authorization whatever to intrude himself between the congregation and the pastor whom it calls. For this reason the historical importance attached to a so-called apostolic succession the-

ory of the ministry is to us as Lutherans not only unwise, but reprehensible and unauthorized by the Word of God.

The Protestant world is done with man-made theories about the validity of ordination and can expect no objective unity of the Church along any such lines. The word "order" does not sound well to Lutherans. It places emphasis at the wrong place. The greatest danger the Christian Church faces to-day is that in the passion for a superficial unity it shall find itself merged into nothingness. The suppression of testimony to the truth instead of emphasis on order for the sake of formal unity and co-operation of the Churches is a peril, to be resisted.

To quote the strong words of the Bishop of Edinburgh given in a charge to the Synod of Edinburgh:

"Unity in external communion without unity in fundamental truth would be, even if it could be obtained, a curse and not a blessing. Any proposition, therefore, looking to the union of the Anglican Church with the Church of Rome, as preparatory to the further and larger step of a complete reunion of Christendom must deal first with the problem of *unity in fundamental truth* between these two great communions."

Our first charge against the emphasis upon an alleged "historic episcopate" accordingly is that it has really wrought for disunity, and chiefly because it places the emphasis at the wrong place. The pressure of a movement for church unity upon such a basis always comes from those who hold the Church chiefly as a great ecclesiastical power. Externalism is their peril. The real power of the Church is not ecclesiastical but spiritual. It is not primarily a great organic agency, but a vital agency working on the lines of conviction and persuasion, through the truth as it is in Christ and the work of the Holy Spirit. The external conception looks to great machinery and bigness is its leading ideal. The world was never less in need of increased machinery and never more in need of the pressure and power of the truth as it is in Jesus which makes men free and sanctifies them through faith in the Son of God.

Union in faith and in the truth there should be. But pleas for union in form and external organization have been overemphasized. That may be imposing to the eye of the world, but spiritually inefficient.

But not only has this alleged "Historic Episcopate" proven to be an obstacle to church unification, but it and all that it connotes is unhistorical. But for the frequency with which the instances of it are met with, it would seem strange to the thoughtful man that any difficulty should be experienced in receiving the simple facts of history because the conclusions to which they lead may chance to run counter of one's personal desires and predilections. But it is not given to all to see or to desire to see the truth in Bacon's "White Light" to which no uncertainty attaches. There are many who would rather view it in the chromatic coloring of their own spectroscope. History is full of such cases of all nationalities and creeds. This frailty of human judgment is much in evidence in the subject under discussion, for abundant and conclusive is the historical proof that Presbyterial ordination was recognized as valid in the Church of England up to the time of Charles I. The clergy of the two church governments, Presbyterial and Episcopal, exchanged pulpits without reordination after the Reformation, when in 1640, in the reign of Charles I, the canon asserting the divine rights of bishops was promulgated. The principles of the Church of England were settled by the Reformers in the times of Edward VI, and Elizabeth, when the liturgy and the "articles" were compiled and revised, and the status of the Church was determined by the law of the realm, which received the assent of the lord's spiritual as well as temporal. That law, as has been shown by the Anglican, Dr. G. A. Jacob, author of "The Ecclesiastical Polity of the New Testament," required those who had received any other than Episcopal ordination only to subscribe to the Articles of religion in order to hold ecclesiastical preferment anywhere in England "no objection at all being valid to the validity of such

ordinations," nor is this all for the same distinguished Episcopal authority adds this explicit testimony:

"It is proved by a great variety and a long series of evidence that during the first hundred years after the beginning of the English Reformation, Presbyterian communities were recognized, and men who had only Presbyterian ordination were received, and obtained the highest preferments in the Church of England."

How the church authorities regarded those who had only been set apart to the ministry by Presbyterian ordination, is as easily determined as the meaning and intent of the Federal Constitution are discovered by an appeal to the writings of Washington, Jefferson, Madison and Hamilton. As the chieftain in the list of such historians we should place Hooker, whose "Ecclesiastical Polity" has not to this day ceased to be a high authority among Anglicans in England and Episcopalians in America. Hooker favored the Episcopacy for the "well being" of the Church, but he did not assert its unvarying necessity, on the contrary affirming this:

"Whereas some do infer that no ordination can stand but only such as is made by bishops which have had their ordination likewise by other bishops before them, till we come to the very apostles. . . . to this we answer that there may be sometimes very just and sufficient reason to allow ordination made without a bishop."

"Ordination made without a bishop," as Prof. Jacob has said, should end all discussion.

In the period of the English Reformation Cranmer distinctly asserted the parity of bishops and presbyters and that bishops needed no special consecration. It has been alleged that he changed his mind on this subject, certain passages from Cranmer's Catechism being quoted in support of the assumption. But this assumption has been effectually undone in one of our most valuable and scholarly historical writings. See Jacobs', "The Lutheran Movement in England," p. 323. In his last days, writing to the Continental Reformers about a contemplated meeting to frame a consensus of doctrine, the English Re-



former assumes no air of condescension and gives no indication of any disposition to "unchurch" the Continental Churches because they were being served by inadequately ordained ministers. To Calvin he urges that harmony in doctrine will have a tendency "to unite *the Churches of God*." In a letter to Bullinger he uses the same kind of speech, while to Melancthon he expresses the same desire for an agreement in the formulating of doctrine among those "*in whose Churches* the doctrine of the Gospel has been restored and purified." In all this correspondence nothing is said about modes of ecclesiastical administration. Differences in this respect were not regarded as important.

The contention that the Episcopal polity exists *pure divine*, and is therefore essential to the being of the Church sprang up in consequence of the conflict with the Presbyterians who under the leadership of Cartwright, the strong champion of the Presbyterian polity, made a like assertion in behalf of their organization. The public avowal of the advanced view of the *pure divine* authority of bishops is commonly traced to a famous sermon preached at St. Paul's cross in 1589, by the famous prelate, Bancroft, who became archbishop of Canterbury in 1604. He was a decided High Churchman who asserted that the Episcopal authority is based upon a divine right, and most violently abused the Puritans frequently attacking them in his sermons. Later, this general doctrine was often held by Anglo-Catholic leaders, who, however, did not press it to the extent of unchurching the foreign Protestant bodies.

But to revert to our appeal to history. We have adduced the testimony of Jacob and Hooker. But there are others. John Keble, author of the "Christian Year," and famous among the leaders of the Oxford movement, admits, in his preface to Hooker's works, that "nearly up to the time that Hooker wrote, 1594, numbers had been admitted by the bishops to the ministry of the Church of England with no better than Presbyterian ordination." And yet again we might adduce the testimony of Bishop

Hall, the well-known author of "Episcopacy by Divine Right Asserted," who says:

"Our brethren returning from foreign [non-episcopal] reformed churches were acknowledged to be ministers of Christ without any other hands laid on them." And the same distinguished prelate says of such that "they have enjoyed spiritual promotions and livings without any exceptions being taken against the lawfulness of their callings."

But there are further Anglican witnesses, for example Strype, the historian, born in 1643, who declares that "Ordinations of the foreign Reformed—non-Episcopal—Churches were made valid, and those that had no other orders were made the same capacity with others to enjoy any place merely on their subscribing the articles."

Another witness is Bishop Burnet, who in his work on the "Articles" of religion says:

"Not only those who penned the Articles but the body of the Church half an age after did acknowledge the foreign Lutheran, Holland, Swedish and French Churches to be true Churches as to all the essentials of a Church." Stillingfleet, another bishop of the Established Church, endorses this language in his own revised edition of Bishop Burnet's work. We also add that Bishop Burnet further testifies that "no bishop in Scotland during my stay did so much as desire any of the Presbyterians to be reordained"; and Bishop Fleetwood [1650-1723] testifies that "To the year 1661 we had many ministers from Scotland, France and the Low Countries who were ordained by presbyters and not by bishops"; and he adds: "They were never reordained."

Hallam, the historian, a man always of guarded statements, says that "the Church of England, whatever tenet might latterly have been broached in this testimony, did not consider the ordination of Presbyterians invalid." While Macauley, in his history, says "Episcopal ordination was now—in 1662—for the first time made an indispensable qualification for preferment." It thus appears that it was ninety-two years after the famous statute of

Queen Elizabeth, which required those who had received ordination other than Episcopal, only to subscribe to the articles of religion and not submit to reordination; it was ninety-two years after the promulgation of this law that, according to Macauley, Episcopal ordination was made an indispensable condition of ecclesiastical preferment.

And all this testimony that we have adduced is in entire harmony with valuable writings in the early Church. The date of Clement's First Epistle to the Corinthians is uncertain, but it was probably composed towards the end of the first century. It was held in high estimation in the early Church. This epistle shows no evidence whatever in favor of the papal or even of the Episcopal constitution of the Church as it afterwards existed. This is remarkable not only in view of the position which Clement held or is supposed to have held, but also in view of the object for which the Epistle was written. The authority of presbyters is asserted and vindicated, and there is no trace anywhere in the epistle, of a distinction between presbyters and bishops.

The name of Ignatius is prominent in the early history of the Church. That prominence is due not to his martyrdom simply, or to the fervent evangelical piety of his letters, but to the fact that he stands forth as the earliest champion of the idea of the Episcopate. In the famous letters of Ignatius there is to be found no trace of Episcopal authority extending beyond a single community of believers. The Episcopal dignity is not made to rest on the ground on which it was soon afterwards to rest and on which it is defended at the present day. In these letters it is not the bishops, but the presbyters, who appear as the successors and representatives of the apostles.

The former are conceived of as being in a sense in which the latter are not, the successors and representatives of Christ—an idea that may be characterized as both false and casual and which may have existed in the community of Jerusalem when, in electing to the episco-

pal office, it evinced a preference for kinsmen of the Redeemer according to the flesh.

In addition to these earlier testimonies we have adduced, a long line of the more recent and best accredited scholars of the Anglican Church might be named. There is for example that master of logical acumen, Archbishop Whately, declaring that "no man in the ministry of the Church of Christ in the present day can be certain that he is in the line of an unbroken Historic Episcopate." There too is Bishop Wadsworth, with his declared willingness to recognize the ordination of "other," i. e., non-Episcopal ministers, and who as late as 1885 in an address to his clergy said:

"It may be reasonably doubted whether orthodox non-Episcopalian bodies have not done more to maintain the true apostolic succession as explained and insisted upon by Irenaeus and Tertullian than the Church of Rome has done."

In recent years no man has stood higher in the lists of Anglican scholars than that of Bishop Lightfoot, who is on record as saying that, "The only priests under the Gospel designated as such in the New Testament are the saints, the members of the Christian brotherhood"; and further, "All Christians are priests alike." Yet again, Bishop Lightfoot says, "The most exalted office in the Church, the highest gift of the Spirit, conveyed no sacerdotal right which was not enjoyed by the humblest member of the Christian community." To this may be added what the same great patristic scholar has said that, "The Episcopate was formed not out of the apostolic order, but out of the presbyterial, and the title which originally was common to all came at length to be appropriated to the chief among them."

"There was a time when it used to be the prevailing belief of the English divines," said the late Dean Stanley, "that Episcopacy, in the sense of the necessity of one presiding officer over the Christian community, reached back to the very first origin of the Christian society. The belief, in the enlarged atmosphere of more exact scholar-

ship and more enlightened candor, has now been abandoned. The most learned of all the living bishops of England, whose accession to the great See of Durham has been recently welcomed by the whole Church of England with a rare unanimity and enthusiasm, has, with his characteristic moderation and erudition proved beyond dispute, in a celebrated essay attached to his edition of St. Paul's Epistle to the Philippians, that the early constitution of the Apostolic Churches of the first century was not that of a single pastor, but of a body of pastors indifferently styled 'bishops' or 'presbyters'; that it was not till the very end of the Apostolic age that the office which we now call the Episcopate gradually and slowly made its way in the churches of Asia Minor; that Presbytery was not a later growth out of Episcopacy, but that Episcopacy was a later growth out of Presbytery; that the office which the apostles adopted was a rule not of bishops, but of presbyters."

A few years ago only the Bishop of Durham wrote in the *Contemporary Review* that he was "distinctly with" Canon Henson in his "powerful appeal for the frank recognition, as Churches, of the non-Episcopal societies, such as the Methodists"; for "I know," he said, "that however boldly modern manuals may tell us that no Bishop no Church is a primary Christian truth, that tenet was declined by such Anglican Bishops as Andrews, Hall, Usher and Cosin, to name only those four names out of well-nigh the whole succession of our greatest Churchmen from the Reformation onward till within quite modern times." In the same review only a year ago the Rev. Dr. Rashdall, Fellow of Oxford, described the theory of apostolic succession as a "gigantic figment."

But a few years ago only it was that one of the leaders among the Episcopal clergy of this country stood in his influential pulpit and declared the position that there could be no Church was "untenable" and cited in confirmation of his own position the views of Whately, Arnold of Rugby, and even Canon Liddon, great as a preacher, but pronounced as a High Churchman.

In a book entitled "The Conception of the Priesthood in the Early Church and in the Church of England," there occurs a lecture on the "Origin of the Ministry" by the famous Prof. Sanday, who gives a lengthy quotation from St. Clement on the apostolical succession and then comments as follows:

"St. Clement is simply insisting on the regular and responsible appointment of the Corinthian presbyters. He does not hint in any way of the transmission of powers nor can his words be translated to have reference to a direct line of descent from the apostles. He is speaking of just what would be natural; nominations to office would be made by an apostle, if one was available, if not, by one whom the Church most trusted; but in all cases the assent of the Church was required."

There is in addition to all this and much more that might be adduced from Anglican sources—the famous Bampton lectures of 1880 given by the Oxford historian, Edwin Hatch, and entitled "The Organization of the Early Christian Churches," and the declaration of the late Dean Farrar that he does "not believe that the Episcopal organization is necessary to a Church." In concluding this part of our discussion we would place alongside with what has already been adduced the strong estimates of two distinguished scholars the one an Englishman and the other a German; the one, Dr. F. J. A. Hort, collaborator with Dr. Westcott in editing one of the best editions of the Greek text of the New Testament, and the other the distinguished historian at the University of Berlin, Adolf Harnack. In a letter to Dr. Hatch, of the date of September 1886, Hort says:

"On the question of organization, I imagine that we agree more than we differ; but some of your language is not such as I should naturally use. I quite go with you in condemning the refusal of fellowship with sister Churches merely because they make no use of some elements of organization assumed to be *jure divino* essential. But it seems to me that the rejection of theoretical and practical exclusiveness clears the ground for the recogni-

tion of at least the possibility that other kinds of (relative) *jus divinum* may be brought to light by history and experience. In organization, as in other things, all Churches have much, I think, to learn from each other, the Church of England as much as any."

In a volume entitled the "Expansion of Christianity," by Harnack, there occurs an excursus on "Organization and the Episcopate," which is a fine piece of erudite research, his contribution on this subject being as valuable as that of Hatch or Lightfoot. Prof. Harnack insists that during the early history of the Christian Church, provincial or monarchical bishops were utterly unknown. Not only small towns but villages also had bishops. Individual Churches had a college of presbyters, bishops and deacons as officers. A bishop—episcopos—overseer, was not a dignitary appointed to rule over a collection or cluster of Churches, but a superintendent of a single Church. The bishop, as understood to-day, according to Harnack, was absolutely unknown in the primitive Church. How the modern style of bishopric, the conception of an "Historic Episcopate," co-ordinated with an alleged "apostolic succession," had its genesis is a question which forms one of the most interesting and complicated of all historical studies, but which Harnack does not elaborate, taking us up only to that crisis when that great event, the establishment by Constantine the Great of the Church-State coalition was consummated. That changed much, for Christianity forthwith lost its simple purity, its pristine dignity and its original spiritual power.

This must end our testimony for the present although there is an abundance remaining for submission. It may be safely assumed, we think, that the great names of the Church of England we have cited, may be accepted as being fully qualified to assert what were the earlier belief and polity of their Church. It remains for those who take issue with them in this matter to meet the testimony presented and show it to be false, or cease to blame dissenters from their opinions, for being obstinate schis-



matics in the Body of Christ. As a common presbyter, who has not shared in the blessing of Episcopal ordination, we would be justified in strongly resenting the bare suggestion of that supercilious and irritating assumption which makes the Episcopal Church synonymous with "the Church." But we have attempted to write not in any captious, or unfriendly spirit, but in that which is historical. Our sincere belief is that the Anglican Church of England and the Episcopal Church of this country must, as they once did, recognize the validity and apostolicity of Lutheran and Presbyterian ordination and stop the persistent advocacy of an Episcopal "succession," before they can get their own much-desired church unity scheme into any kind of working order.

Many good and sincere advocates of the exclusive Episcopal theory are saying to us, "If you acknowledge our orders, why are you not then willing to receive ordination at the hands of our bishops and thus heal the great schism of disunity in the Christian Church." The answer has been well provided in the words of the late Dr. Henry J. Van Dyke: "Because first we cannot consent to be ordained twice, and second, we cannot admit the assumption on which the necessity for Episcopal ordination is based." We cannot consent to revoke our one and sufficient ordination to submit to that which so many capable and devout Episcopalians, who have shown that an "Historic Episcopate" is not Scriptural, is not apostolic, is not primitive, and has not been perpetual.

It is a matter not only of interest, but of instruction also to note the attitude one toward the other of bodies of Christians who hold all alike tenaciously to the "Historic Episcopate" and its implication of an "apostolic succession." Behind the Anglican movement for organic union of the Church there always somehow lurks the hope of a recognition some day by the Church of Rome. That foolish infatuation which a few years ago sent the Church of England on its knees before the pope imploring him to recognize the validity of Anglican orders, still holds in bondage the imagination of many good people of that

communion in England and America. The answer of Rome, as it is likely to continue to be was an emphatic and well-deserved snub. Why should the Episcopal Church care what Rome thinks about its orders? Or why should it continue to delude itself with the notion that it stands midway between Rome and Protestantism and is therefore fitted to lead in a work of reconciliation among the dismembered hosts of the latter? That Church seems to have proceeded on the assumption that it is well adapted to win all elements, being as it supposes a kind of common middle meeting ground for Protestants and Romanists. But this attitude, no doubt, assumed in all sincerity, we must regard as a delusion. In practical operation it is a demonstrated failure.

If the Anglican Church is truly Protestant it is not papal, and if even moderately papal it is not truly Protestant. There is no possible intermediate ground, as Romanism will not compromise with Protestantism by laying aside any of its unscriptural errors and pretensions, and true Protestantism will not compromise with Rome by giving countenance to any of its unscriptural doctrines or submitting to any of its tyrannical usurpations of authority. This position was taken by our fathers in the faith four hundred years ago and who under the leadership of Luther, had the faith and courage to revolt and insist upon a return to the Scriptures.

An illuminating chapter on the contradictions furnished by people who alike insist upon an "Historic Episcopate" and the "succession," is furnished us in the attitude of the pope, Leo XIII, on the question of the validity of Anglican orders. A body of very advanced churchmen in England had been hoping to gradually bring the English and Roman Catholic Churches together by securing some concession from the Church of Rome on the question of the validity of English orders. The refusal of the Church of Rome to recognize the validity of such orders had been the great stumbling block in the way of many advanced churchmen who would otherwise have gone over to Rome. That Church had steadily insisted

upon the reconfirmation of all converts from the Church of England and the reordination of all English clergymen who wish to enter the Roman priesthood. The belief had gained ground that a pope supposed to be as liberal-minded as Leo XIII, might be induced to modify the historic policy of the Church and let down the bars to English Catholics. The pope ordered an investigation to be made by accredited scholars. Mr. Gladstone, who was then living, took part in the matter and published a letter in which he hailed the investigation as the evidence of a desire on the part of the pope to conciliate the English Church and as a step toward the reunion of the two bodies of English Catholics and Roman Catholics.

"It is to the last degree improbable," says Mr. Gladstone, "that a ruler of known wisdom would at this time put in motion the machinery of the Curia for the purpose of widening the breach which severs the Roman Catholic Church from the Anglican communion." Furthermore, "to make the religious differences between the Churches of Christendom conspicuous to the world, and to bring them into a state of the highest fixity so as to enhance the difficulty of approaching them at a future time in the spirit of reconciliation . . . would be no less important than deplorable."

But all came to nothing, for in a short time this message came from Rome:

"The pope has issued an apostolic letter in which he says, 'After study I must confirm the decrees of my predecessors that all ordinations made under the Anglican rite are absolutely invalid.' His Holiness also entreats the Anglican clergy to return to the Catholic Church."

To a great party in the Anglican Church this was a momentous decision. It blasted the hopes of churchmen high. Many had deluded themselves and the English Church with the hope that the gracious pope—the vicar of Christ and viceregent of God—would allow them a place to stand, if not within the holy place, at least within the inner court. But at the last they found themselves remanded to the court of the Gentiles. They could stand

afar off and admire, but they cannot enter in. The case had been lost and thenceforth the Church of England, from the standpoint of Rome, is no Church at all—no better than the Church of Luther, or the Church of Calvin or that of John Wesley. The meaning of Leo's pronouncement was simply this, that all other chief pastors than those who are his own curates are but a "lawless and disorderly crew" and all other orders than those derived from the See of St. Peter are invalid and worthless.

Papal documents of this order are always notably suave, diplomatic, courteous, almost cordial and fragrant in tone, but above all and beyond all, studiously disastrous in statement. But the meaning is always well-known, viz, that unity with Rome is possible only on condition that the other party accept every article of faith set forth authoritatively by the Church of Rome and bow to the jurisdiction of the Roman pontiff as his superior and chief shepherd by divine right. Leo XIII put an end to one of the empty controversies of his day when, as a representative of the alleged "Historic Episcopate," he declared frankly and blandly to others who believe in the same thing that they had no ecclesiastical standing, belonging to a Church which is schismatic, whose priests are no priests at all, whose bishops are only pretentious shams, and whose ordinations confer no power to administer the sacraments.

The discussions pertaining to the unification of the Church on the basis of an "Historic Episcopate," now reaching over a long term of years, have served to demonstrate the fact that the true basis for such unification is not to be found in things external and artificial.

No better statement of the truth on the matter has been made by men than this from the Augsburg Confession of 1530—"and for the true unity of the Church, it is sufficient to agree concerning the doctrines of the Gospel and the administration of the sacraments. Nor is it necessary that the same human traditions, that is rites

and ceremonies instituted by men should be everywhere observed."

Real unity is not uniformity, and is possible only where variety exists; nor is it conformity to the external, but is oneness of spirit.

The prayer of our Lord for unity does not obligate His disciples to stand alike at the same theological, scientific, exegetical, or ecclesiastical angle of vision, but that while they might differ in their opinions, in their apprehension of the Gospel, in their methods of work and modes of worship, and in organization, they might be one in spirit, yet giving to their experiences a diversity of expression.

In Ephesians 4:1-7, St. Paul speaks to the common consciences of Christians; they are inter-penetrated by one spirit, united in one faith, administering one baptism, called in one calling. Christianity is essentially not form, but substance, not body, but spirit, not formula, but life. This oneness of heart and feeling the spirit works in all true believers. This and not any piece of machinery, however beautiful or effective, forms the Holy Catholic Church of Christ, founded upon the Rock of Ages, redeemed by the sacrifice of the cross, vitalized by the one Word and Spirit, and glorified by the one eternal hope—this is the true Church of God, imperishable, against which even the gates of hell shall not prevail. That Church is not, and has not been dominated by a unity that is merely organic, including the whole Church under one universal government. The apostles were not sent to rule, but to evangelize the world. The hope that all the true life of the Church on earth will ever be compassed in one visible organic shape, is likely to continue to be an idle dream. In the true interpretation the Church is one and cannot be divided. Whosoever is of God is of His Church; whosoever is of Christ is of His body which is the Church of the living God, the pillar and ground of the truth. The real life of the Church is the life of the redeemed man and the life of the redeemed man is increasingly the incarnation of the spirit of Christ.

*Hamma Divinity School,  
Springfield, Ohio.*

## ARTICLE V.

## CURRENT THEOLOGICAL THOUGHT.

BY PROFESSOR J. A. SINGMASTER, D.D.

In the *Review and Expositor* (April) Dr. Batten, of Philadelphia, speaks of "The Churches and the Present War" in this wise:

"The Church of to-day faces the greatest challenge and supreme opportunity of its long history. Never have men felt the woes of society as keenly as to-day. Never have such vital questions been up for a hearing. Never have men needed a wise, strong leadership with vision and power more than to-day. One and all the leaders and saviors of the world have failed. Men have tried diplomacy; and it cannot help us; in fact, it is in large part responsible for the war. They have tried education; but it cannot change the heart and vitalize the will. They have looked to science; but it confesses its helplessness to-day. When half gods go, then God arrives. The ground is cleared for a religion of vision and reality and power."

"What then shall the Churches do? They must regain the idea of the Kingdom of God and make it central in their thought and the inspiration of all effort. They must find the great elemental truths of Christianity and give them due emphasis. They must have done with half truths and make-believe, and have a religion of reality. The teachers and prophets of the Churches must stand in their towers and set themselves upon the watch that they may know the mind of the Lord and may have a message for the people. Leaders and people must take Jesus Christ seriously and must be willing to go the whole length with the Son of Man. The Churches must organize their forces for effective work and must see that they are called at once to believe in the Kingdom of God and to make it a reality in the world. In the gospel, as

we believe, we have the very truth of God. Then the Churches must take the truth of God plain to men and must apply that truth to all the relations of society. In the Gospel of the Son of God there are natural potencies beyond our imagination to measure. These potencies to be effective in the world must be incarnated first in the lives of Christian men, and through their efforts released into the world. But only a fraction of these potencies is actually released and made effective. The Churches must cease to limit the grace of God as they have done. Through their faith, their willingness, their devotion, they must provide a channel and means whereby the potencies of the gospel can attain their full results, and the gospel may indeed become the power of God unto the salvation of the world."

---

The Quarterlies teem with articles suggested by the world war. *The Bibliotheca Sacra* prints an article on "The Christian Attitude Toward War," by Dr. J. E. Wishart, who holds that even war must be carried on "as to the Lord and not unto men," and that in so far as the military end in view will permit soldiers should "be ready to show to the foe the kindness and love of the Master."

"It is hard on the battlefield; it is also hard in the place of business, in the pastor's study, and even in the pulpit. But reports that constantly come in prove that this hard thing is possible for the boys in khaki, and that it is being achieved by many of them while the cannons thunder and the machine guns scatter death around them. Amid all the ruin that this insane war has brought, the cross of Calvary stands more supreme than ever as the one thing that will meet the needs of the battle-torn earth. And this very conflict in which the forces of evil have done their worst, may perhaps be the great opportunity of the Church of God.

To sum up, War is essentially an evil. It is sad, indeed, if it must be confessed that we can find no better way of settling international differences than the irrational, the unspeakably wicked, method of the wholesale



slaughter of men by all the improved devices that science can invent. We cannot but hope that the futility, the madness, of such returns to the life of the jungle, may become so manifest in the present crisis, that we may soon behold "the Parliament of Men, the Federation of the World." But as long as nations, in their lust for power, run amuck and attempt to destroy freedom and the rights of men, it will be necessary that governments which acknowledge that they are ordained of God should fight His battles, and it is the duty of the Christian to bear his part in such struggles."

The same review contains an article by Thomas Edward Barr on "The Bible and Literature," from which we quote:

"Where will you read a pastoral more naively beautiful than that of Ruth? Dr. Johnson published it as a story he had chanced upon in his reading, and the Court, to whom the Bible was an unknown book, were in raptures over it—until he told them where to find it! The story of Esther moves like a staged performance, such is the historic art of its telling. The life of Jesus is a pageant through which He moves, central figure of every scene, and sharing in every conceivable phase of human suffering and woe.

It is said that once Philips Brooks, about to start on a vacation, stepped into a bookstore for some light reading for the journey. Picking up a new work of fiction he said, 'Does this end happily?' 'No,' said the dealer, 'that is a tragedy.' "Then I don't want it. There is so much real sorrow in the world, no one should be allowed to publish a story that doesn't have a happy ending." Viewed as literature, the Bible meets even this test. The drama of redemption, it finds in its opening tragedy a seed of hope—the woman's son shall bruise the serpent's head. Through every darkening cloud of disappointment and disgrace—and how black some of them are,—to the deepening midnight which shrouded the final grapple on Calvary, there shines the star of hope. With the morning of the resurrection a new life begins. Disappointment and

persecution come; but there is the steadfast hope of the triumph of the faith; and the last vision of the Nazarene despised and rejected of men, crucified for the sins of many, is in the glory of the new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness."

---

The following pertinent quotation from F. P. Ramsay's article on "Christianity and Humanitarian Patriotism" in the *Princeton Theological Review* will find ready approval.

"Let Christianity come to socialists with a tenderer sympathy and a more sensitive insight into the causes of suffering and wrong, with a deeper passion for social justice, and with a greater faith in the ability of the rightly organized state to do away with the social injustice, than socialism possesses, and help them build a state that will be an efficient instrument of the few for securing the conditions of well-being for some. Let Christianity come to democrats with a profounder sense of human rights and of the dignity of the individual man than ever mere humanitarian democracy can teach, and help them to end the crime of the ages, the exploitation of the many of the few. Let us build a superstate that will protect all peoples against criminal nations, and in every nation a state that will protect the Church, and the family, and the individual, in their rightful spheres of liberty. Let us see that the heritage of intellectual and material wealth accumulated by mankind through the toil of the ages is so far given to all, that all shall receive the finest and broadest culture that they are capable and willing to receive, and have the conditions of the higher living. Let us search out the evils that are, and the evils that threaten to be, and let us not rest till those are cured and these are prevented, so far as co-operating intelligence can cure and prevent, without destroying human freedom and righteousness. Let us not rest content with any good for ourselves, so long as any of our human brothers are destitute of that good. And let us advertise our best, even Jesus Christ, by our own saved lives and by our

grateful testimony, to all men with a zeal no other ism can show."

"But all this is impossible, if we surrender Christianity to humanitarian patriotism, even though it speak like Jesus, and though it praise Him more than the multitudes at His triumphal entry. It is the Christ that must be our Saviour and Lord, the Christ that died for our sins and rose again for our justification, this Christ, the Son of God, now living and reigning. The deadliest enemy of our time to the Christianity of Jesus Christ is the mere humanitarianism which admires Jesus as a man but refuses to adore Christ as the Son of God."

Dr. Schmauk in an article in the *Lutheran Church Review* on the "Ethics of Nations," says:

"It is true that history demonstrates the danger of any organic combination between the institution of the State and any institution of organized religion. Christianity has struggled for ages to gain freedom of faith and action; and the State has struggled almost as long to cast off the shackles of priestcraft and of the Church. But the separation of these two organized entities, one spiritual and the other secular, does not require the suppression of the divine character that underlies the principles of both. To go to this extreme, and divest the theory of the State from any faith in a divine source, or from any moral responsibility laid upon it by that source, is as great a wrong as to divest the origin of species from any divine creation, or the upholding of the nations from any divine providence."

"God still rules the world, even though evil be tolerated, or be apparently triumphant. God has some purpose in the movements of people as well as of persons. No Christian may exclude all divine element from the foundation or operation of government. All citizens who believe that government is of God, that the State is a divinely instituted organism, must feel a duty and responsibility, to the extent of their civic powers and privileges, whether in each case these be large or small, of seeing

that the will of God for the State control of the State and be carried out in and through it. No Christian dare consider the State an ethical neutral. The powers of the State are to be defined, enlarged, limited, framed and executed in accordance with the will of God for nations, in so far as Christians can legitimately influence the conduct of public affairs.

"Any non-Christian minority, whether agnostics, materialists, anarchists, socialists or atheists, will not suffer, but gain in their rights and privileges, under a government so conducted. For government in accordance with the will of God, who maketh His sun shine on the good and the bad, and who hath sent His Son to fulfill His purposes of justice and grace and to teach men to do as they would be done by, is the only liberty-giving government in all the earth."

---

*The Reformed Church Review* (April) contains several notable biographical articles. The one is by Prof. G. W. Richards on "The Theology of Professor Henry Harbaugh," in commemoration of the one hundredth anniversary of his birth. Dr. Richards says of him: "While he advanced beyond the static orthodoxy of his time, he did not, however, reach the positions of conservative liberalism of our day. He simply prepared the way for it." Harbaugh was a Mediationalist, and the Medionalists have given way to the Ritchlians!

Dr. Theo. F. Herman, a colleague of Dr. Richard, and a successor of Dr. Harbaugh in the chair of Theology in the Lancaster Seminary, pays his respects to his immediate predecessor, Dr. Gerhart, as follows:

"Finally, Dr. Gerhart's theology was churchly and sacramental. This again is simply a further extension of the Christocentric principle as applied to the doctrines of the Church and of salvation. The Church, according to the teaching of Mercersburg, was the perpetuation of the incarnation. It was the God-man continuously and permanently present in history. The head of this organism was the glorified Christ, and its body consisted of those

who shared His life, through mystic union with Him. Christ glorified in heaven and regenerate men on earth together constitute one mystic body. This is the Christian Church, holy, catholic and apostolic, in whose communion men may obtain salvation and eternal life."

"It is evident that this doctrine of the Church is the logical sequence of the Mercersburg doctrine of the incarnation. The incarnate Christ was Christianity complete, but there must be an organ, or a medium, through which Christ imparts His saving life to the world. That organ is the Christian Church. Hence the Church was not a human society produced by the voluntary association of its members for worship and work, but a new organism whose generic principle is the divine-human life mediated to man by the Holy Ghost."

"In making the incarnation the cardinal principle of Christianity rather than the doctrine of the atonement or the sovereignty of God, Dr. Gerhart returned to the central truth of Christian revelation. Here he was not merely the heir of the noblest theology of the past, but also the prophet of a still nobler theology of the future, when that profound truth shall be seen and stated in its full significance, as binding together creation, regeneration, and redemption, and as making Jesus Christ, the revealer of God and man, the central fact in history, in whom God and man meet in a communion of life. Here, modern theology is in profound accord with the theology of Dr. Gerhart in making this Christological idea of the incarnation vital and constructive in its thinking."

"And yet, here also, one must note important modifications. According to Dr. Gerhart, the incarnation meant the organic union in Christ of the divine nature and of the human nature. He did, indeed, mark an immense advance over all previous Christologies, in that he conceived these two natures to be mutually compatible, as kindred and not as alien. Hence the incarnation was not the incomprehensible mystery of the union of two mutually and incompatible natures, but rather the coming of God into a human nature that was akin to His own, and pouring a

divine fullness of life into a human vessel creatively adapted to receive it."

---

"The Christian and Hindu Conceptions of Sin," by Dr. John McKenzie, of Wilson College, Bombay, published in the *International Review of Missions*, shows the fundamental difference in their views concerning the soul and sin.

"The Christian believes in the reality of the soul as an individual existence; he believes that it is essentially eternal. The typical Hindu believes that the distinction of me and thee is the outcome of ignorance. To the Christian the world is real, not in the sense that he has here a 'continuing city,' but in the sense that God is manifested in it, and that man can realize God's purposes concerning Him in it. To the typical Hindu the world does not reveal God but is a veil concealing Him. The attitude of the Hindu mind to sin is closely connected with this. The Christian believes that God's will is revealed in all the variety of relationships into which he enters in the world, and that in failing to fulfil or in perverting these relationships he rebels against the will of God, and so commits sin. The Christian ideal is not withdrawal from the world, but the carrying out of the purposes of God in the world. To the Hindu on the other hand the world has seemed to be evil, and Hindu ethics is consequently to a very large extent negative in character. The problem is, in one aspect of it, not how the individual may attain a positive good but how negatively he may be least entangled with the world."

---

In the same *Review*, J. T. Webster discusses "The Need of a New Policy in Jewish Missions."

"Throughout the world there are in round figures thirteen and a half million Jews. Of these, six and a quarter million are under Russian rule, two and a quarter million under Austria-Hungary, 600,000 in Germany, half a million in the British Empire, 385,000 under the sway of Turkey, 250,000 in Roumania, 235,000 under the rule of

France and 117,000 under that of Holland; in Morocco there are 110,000, in Argentina 100,000 and in the United States of America two and a quarter millions; the remaining numbers are scattered among twenty-four other States."

The author opposes Zionism on several grounds, of which the following is very convincing:

"Furthermore, the soil of Palestine now belongs to the Arab and the land itself has paramount associations for the Christian, not so much for the sake of the Jews as for the sake of One, a Jew, who is a universal possession. Neither let us forget in all the talk about a return of the Jews to Palestine that not merely since the fall of Jerusalem but since the Babylonian captivity itself, only a fraction of the Jews ever lived there; nor would there be room for them if they were to go. And above all let us keep clearly in mind that the overwhelming majority have no desire to move to or settle in the Holy Land. In sum the meaning of these considerations for us is that, although in the course of years many may find a home in the land of their forefathers, the Jews as a whole will still remain a scattered people, entering every land which offers them an open door and scope for their enterprise, and our primary concern is with the evangelization, in the lands where we find them, of the freed masses hitherto untouched by Christian teaching. If, as we believe, the present war is a war of liberation, the situation created cannot be regarded otherwise than as a direct call and invitation from God to the Church to enter the open door with the message of Christ."

---

The first number of the new *Anglican Theological Review* came out in May. It makes a handsome appearance and its contents are interesting and scholarly. Its editors are Samuel A. B. Mercer and Leicester C. Lewis, professors in the Western Theological Seminary, Chicago. In introducing the *Review* the editors say, "Only one excuse can be offered for the appearance in America of a new quarterly periodical limited to discussion of theo-



logical subjects by students of the Anglican communion. The excuse is simply that the field is vacant, and needs to be filled."

We quote a summary of Prof. Lewis' article on "Troeltsch and Ritschl, A Study in Epochs":

1. The sixteenth, seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries were dominated in the whole of their intellectual activities by the inspiration of Individualism. Of this controlling impulse Protestantism was the most supple expression, although even the Roman Church was not uninfluenced by precisely the same Zeitgeist.

2. At the end of the period appeared Ritschl, whose system has for both its strength and weakness, the expression of this same cardinal principle of Individualism, uniting in itself the highest devolpment of the Protestantism of the period with the contemporary philosophy, Idealism.

3. That the world of to-day differs in practically every form of intellectual activity from the world prior to the eighties, and that the new impulse which is bringing forth fruit in many spheres of thought to-day is that of socialism, with its starting point in the group rather than in the member.

4. That Troeltsch, as the great Systematizer of the Religionsgeschichtliche Schule, is the prophet of a new era in religious emphasis, and that the limiting inconsistencies of his thought would be removed, could be shaken off the lingering taint of individualistic subjective Protestantism, and find rest in the only truly socialized and empirical system, the consciousness of the Catholic Church.

*Gettysburg, Pa.*

## ARTICLE VI.

## REVIEW OF RECENT LITERATURE.

WARTBURG PUBLISHING HOUSE. CHICAGO.

*Wartburg Lesson Helps for Beginners in the Sunday School and Home.* By Professor M. Reu, D.D., of Wartburg Seminary, Dubuque, Iowa. 8vo. Pp. 212.

These lessons were first published in German under the title "fuer die Kleinsten." They have been put into English by Pastors H. Brueckner and Otto Proehl, of the German Iowa Synod with which Dr. Reu is also connected. They are intended for use in the teaching of very small children, as both the German and the English titles indicate, and they are admirably adapted to their purpose. They are divided into two Parts. Part One contains thirty lessons on the life of Christ. Part Two has twenty-two lessons somewhat more advanced, dealing with our relation to God as our Creator, Protector, and our Heavenly Father. Each lesson is illustrated with a very simple but effective picture. Christian parents would find these lessons very helpful in teaching their little ones in the home, even before starting them to the Sunday School.

JACOB A. CLUTZ.

*He Whom Thou Lovest is Sick.* By Pastor Staudermann. 16mo. Pp. 80.

This is a compilation of Scripture passages and brief selections of verse appropriate for use in the sick room either by the visiting pastor, or by the sick themselves. The selections are made with excellent judgment, and are arranged under suitable headings, "Admonition to be Faithful Unto Death," "Consolation for the Penitent," "For Those Who Despair of God's Goodness in Prolonged or Incurable Sickness," etc. Each part is followed by an appropriate prayer.

JACOB A. CLUTZ.

LUTHERAN BOOK CONCERN. COLUMBUS, OHIO.

*Funeral Sermons by Lutheran Divines.* Collected and

Edited by Rev. L. H. Schuh, Ph.D. 8vo. Pp. 433.  
Price \$1.50.

Among the most difficult and trying duties of the average pastor is the preaching of funeral sermons. Especially is this the case with the younger men in the ministry. This volume is pretty sure, therefore, of a cordial welcome. It covers a wide field and will be found rich in suggestions. There are in all forty-eight sermons, contributed by twenty-seven different ministers, nearly all of them active pastors. They have been selected from six different branches of the Lutheran Church in America.

The sermons are adapted to a great variety of occasions. Indeed, it would be difficult to think of any circumstances under which a pastor would not find here a sermon to suit. There are fourteen intended for the funerals of children, eight for young people, eighteen for the middle aged, and eighteen for old or elderly men and women. Among them are titles covering specific cases of every kind. There is one even "For women who died at the washtub."

The volume would have been more convenient for use if it had been paged consecutively throughout and prefaced by a general Table of Contents. Instead of this it is divided into four Parts, as indicated above, and each Part is paged separately and has its own Table of Contents at the beginning of it. This is rather confusing if one is looking for a sermon for a particular occasion. The reason for this arrangement is to found probably in the fact that the Parts are published separately also.

J. A. SINGMASTER.

*Outlines of Biblical Hermeneutics, A Handbook for Students of the Word.* By George H. Schodde, Ph.D., D.D., Professor of Theology Ev. Luth. Seminary, Capital University, Columbus, Ohio. Cloth. 5 x 8. Pp. 235. Price \$1.50 prepaid.

A melancholy interest is attached to this volume, whose author was called to his reward as it was passing through the press. Dr. Schodde was a fine scholar and a prolific author, and he will be greatly missed by the Lutheran Church.

In the Introductory Note, Dr. Schodde says: "The leading purpose of this volume is to bring Bible facts to bear on Bible interpretation. \* \* \* The writer, while adhering strictly to the old historic principles of the Lu-

theran Church, is yet convinced that even now the Holy Spirit is still operative in the Church and has taught the people of our times also some new things concerning that deepest of all books—the Holy Scriptures.”

The language of the volume is simple, adapting it to lay readers as well as to scholars. It will be found to be very useful to all Bible students in giving them, in a brief and comprehensive way, an outline of what the Bible is, how it came to be, and how it should be interpreted. Of course this book is no way a commentary, but precedent to it.

The Contents are three-fold, with proper subdivisions, (1) The Bible as the Object of Interpretation; (2) The General Principles of Hermeneutics; (3) Special Hermeneutics.

Concerning inspiration the author holds firmly that the Holy Spirit is the real Author of the Bible in giving the truths of salvation to men; but “the how and the manner or the philosophy of inspiration,” he says, “has not been revealed and is a mystery of faith to be accepted, but not to be explained.” The Holy Spirit used men as they were and with the degree of knowledge which they had. For instance, the New Testament writers in quoting the Old Testament used versions in common use, and not the original Hebrew. Many of the alleged difficulties of the Bible are easily explained, while others may be cleared up after fuller investigation. The Bible is not discredited by minor difficulties, but fully justifies all its claims to the faith of the believer.

The principles governing interpretation must be the expression and development of the fundamental Protestant hermeneutical idea that *the Scriptures are self-interpreting*. This includes a knowledge of the original languages, the context, the analogy of the faith, the proper use of reason and the like.

We take pleasure in commending Biblical Hermeneutics for its simplicity, learning, and conservatism.

J. A. SINGMASTER.

THE MACMILLAN CO. NEW YORK.

*Can We Believe in Immortality?* By James H. Snowden, D.D., LL.D. Cloth. Pp. 224. Price \$2.25.

In thirty-five brief chapters Dr. Snowden summarizes the arguments against and for a belief in the immortality of the soul. The positive argument is stated in a cum-

mulative way, so that no serious doubt remains in the mind of the candid reader as to the persistency of life beyond the tomb. Science is not unfriendly to this belief. Investigation of the relation of soul and body clearly indicate the superiority of the former. Personality demands immortality. The instinctive longing of the heart is for survival. Huxley wrote in 1883 when near sixty years of age, "It is a curious thing that I find my dislike to the thought of extinction increasing as I get older."

The incompleteness of the soul in the present life and the pragmatic value of a belief in immortality demand another life. It is not conceivable that great souls are forever extinguished, least of all that Christ lived his brief life and then forever passed away. His well authenticated resurrection makes such a conception impossible.

Such is the general line of thought presented with learning and eloquence, confirming our conviction that death does not end all.

J. A. SINGMASTER.

*The Psychology of Preaching.* By Charles S. Gardner, Professor of Homiletics and Sociology in the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary. 8vo. Pp. XIV + 389. Price \$2.00.

In this fine volume Professor Gardner takes up a comparatively new line of discussion. As he says in the Preface: "The field of educational psychology has been very thoroughly worked over, though the last word has by no means been said. The help which teachers have derived from it is very great, and no one now is considered equipped for that noble profession who has not mastered its principles. But so far as my knowledge extends there have been few serious efforts to apply modern psychology to preaching. Indeed, the statement might be made more nearly absolute without doing violence to facts. There have been homiletical works almost without number, applying the formal rules of logic and rhetoric to sermon-making, and books on elocution are even more numerous. But the works discussing the preparation and delivery of sermons rarely, if ever, approach the subject from the standpoint of modern functional psychology. The psychological conceptions underlying most of these treatises belong to a stage of psychological thought long since past."

Of course, many of the points raised by Professor Gardner are treated more or less fully by writers on homiletics, especially the more recent ones, but the psychological point of view is not so evident. Others of them are discussed more thoroughly in books on the psychology of religion, but in these the definite application of the discussion to preaching is lacking. The only book of which we have knowledge that could be at all classed with the volume under review is Professor Scott's "The Psychology of Public Speaking," published in 1906. Professor Gardner refers to this work, but as the title would indicate it has no special reference to preaching, and the treatment is not so full or so thorough as Professor Gardner's.

Professor Gardner has done his work very thoroughly, too thoroughly, perhaps, for the average reader even among ministers for whom it is especially intended. His book cannot be read cursorily, not, at least, if it is to be understood and digested. It is not a book to be taken along on a summer vacation unless the vacationist means to do some very solid work in connection with his rest and recreation. Possibly this would be a good thing to do. It may not be wise to give up all study during vacation. There is danger of returning from vacation with the mind relaxed and weakened by long inactivity and less able to take up and carry on the work of sermon-making than when the vacation began. The careful reading and study of such a volume as this of Professor Gardner's would go far towards toning up the mind and preparing a man to do more effective pulpit work than ever before. At any rate, this is the only way to deal with a book like this. It must be read with care, and possibly re-read again and again. It must be studied, thought about, meditated on, mastered. We believe that every minister who will so use it will find it most suggestive and helpful.

In the early chapters, and indeed all through the volume, the author devotes considerable time to the discussion of general psychology. He does this, as he explains in the preface, because he hopes "that the book may secure a wide reading among ministers generally, and even among other public speakers; and it is probable that numbers of them can not safely be assumed to have a very thorough acquaintance with the rather new but fascinating science of functional psychology." But the subject is always approached from a very practical standpoint rather than from a merely theoretical or technical

one. The author always keeps in mind the fact, and the reader is never allowed long to forget it, that the book is intended for preachers and is intended to help them to better understand and do their work.

There are fourteen chapters. The first one deals with "General Controls of Conduct," the second with "Mental Images," the third with "Mental Systems," the fourth with "Feeling," the fifth with "Sentiments and Ideals," the sixth with "The Excitation of Feeling," the seventh with "Belief," the eighth with "Attention," the ninth with "Voluntary Action," the tenth with "Suggestion," the eleventh with "Assemblies," the twelfth with "Mental Epidemics," the thirteenth with "Occupational Types," and the fourteenth with "The Modern Mind." It is easy to see from these chapter headings how the author leads us on from the theoretical to the practical and makes all his lines of approach to converge on the work of the public speaker and especially of the preacher.

One of the most interesting and suggestive chapters in the book is the one on "Attention." Before the preacher can hope to accomplish anything with his hearers he must gain and hold their attention. How to do this most successfully is one of his most difficult and perplexing problems. There is much in this chapter to assist him in the solution of this problem. Not a few preachers resort to sensational methods of advertising and presenting their subject matter in the hope of thus attracting attention and drawing a crowd. There may be a legitimate as well as an illegitimate sensationalism. The author clearly points the way to the distinction between them. "Often the devices used to compel attention are most likely to divert it from the subject matter of the discourse. Perhaps the line between the legitimate and the illegitimate in sensation should be drawn just here: 'sensationalism' is objectionable because it ordinarily means the use of devices for compelling attention in such a way that the interest is centered upon the speaker himself, or his methods, rather than upon his message."

In the chapter on "Suggestion" we have an important distinction recognized between persuasion and suggestion. Both aim at influencing the belief and action of another; but the methods are very different, if not directly opposite. Persuasion seeks something more than uncritical assent and unreflective action; its objective is rational conviction and action, which is the reaction of the *whole* mind. Its method, therefore, is to face all the essential issues, to meet and allay all opposing considerations by



open reasoning. In persuasion, appeals to the feelings are legitimate, important; but the appeals must be made in the light of all the relevant facts and conditions. In suggestion the effort is to avoid rousing the self of the person into full activity, often to reduce his self-activity to a minimum, and thus to graft one's own idea or purpose on to his mental life. In persuasion the effort is to help another in his self-activity to reach a rational and satisfactory conclusion, by a skillful and truthful presentation of the favoring and opposing considerations. . . . . No nobler activity can engage one's mind than the persuasion of men to right action, and the fruition of such endeavor is the sweetest and most satisfying to which men can attain. Let the preacher, above all men, cultivate a scrupulous conscience as to the psychological method which he uses; and, guarding against all cheap and false substitutes, keep himself faithfully to his function and make his appeals to the rational nature of men."

In the chapter on "Assemblies" some discriminating things are said about the value of the excessive emotionalism found in connection with a certain class of evangelistic campaigns: "Is the process of psychic fusion conducive to genuine religious experience? A categorical and unqualified answer can not be given without conflict with the facts. High pressure revivals do result in the improvement of the lives of some persons; but it is quite certain that they result in an equally permanent demoralization and spiritual depreciation of other lives—just as we should expect. Not a few people have become so utterly perverted in the moral habits contracted in their individual experience, and so abnormally subject to grossly evil impulses, that a powerful counter-stimulation of their emotional nature is necessary in order that better impulses may have any chance at all to influence their choices. But, of course, there is always danger, when this counter-stimulation is applied through the collective emotion of the crowd, that the reason of the person in question, as well as that of others, will be so paralyzed that the resulting action will not represent *choice* at all; and then there is every reason to believe that the effect upon character is demoralizing and only demoralizing. The moral pervert returns to his wallowing in the mire, and his last state is worse than the first and, meanwhile, others who are more normal and who are swept by the same tide of irrational emotion into false professions and relations are religiously 'queered' for the rest of their lives."

The closing chapter on "The Modern Mind," is also full of interest and valuable suggestions for the preacher who wants to know just where his people live and how he can best reach them with the truth. But we do not have space for further quotations.

The reader may not always agree with the positions taken by the author in this volume, or with the conclusions drawn from them. There is not much profit in reading a book which arouses no opposition, starts no questions. Such a book will not awaken much thought or prove very stimulating to our mental powers. But we are sure that no earnest-minded minister can read and study this book of Professor Gardner's without mental stimulus. It will certainly provoke thought. It is likely to expose weaknesses in method, and it will also point the way to greater wisdom and skill. It will make him a better and more successful preacher.

JACOB A. CLUTZ.

*This Life and the Next.* By F. T. Forsyth. Cloth. Pp. 122. Price \$1.00.

Principal Forsyth in his usual vigorous style presents an apologetic on the immortality of the soul from the standpoint of the reaction of a belief in a future life upon the present life. "It is not a question," says he, "about the basis of a belief in immortality, but about its moral rebound. We often hear from pulpits of the effect of this life on the next; but this is not a pulpit and what we are now to dwell on is rather the reaction of the next life on this."

In thirteen brief chapters the author proves his case very well, by showing the powerful and blessed influence of the doctrine of immortality upon the life and labors of men. We regret that the argument is marred by various subtle errors which to a large degree mar the value of the book. It is said (p. 13), "Death does not fix the moral position of the soul irretrievably. Other methods of moral discipline lie beyond." This connotes a probation after death. This teaching has no foundation in Scripture and has wrought much mischief wherever accepted. The author actually advocates the Romish doctrine of purgatory in a modified form. He declares, "We threw away too much when we threw out the baby with the dirty water of its bath. There are more conversions on the other side than in this, if the crisis of death opens the eyes as I have said." In harmony with this he advocates

praying for the dead. "Nothing in our Christian belief is against it," says the author, "and there is a good deal for it."

And yet in spite of this out-and-out Romanism he declares that Luther was "but half de-catholicized"! Evidently he doesn't know Luther, the freeman, the liberator, the Pauline Christian. Suffice it to say here that perverts to Romanism from the Lutheran faith are the rarest exceptions while hundreds from other communions have trod in the path which Dr. Forsyth seems to be entering.

J. A. SINGMASTER.

THE ABINGTON PRESS. NEW YORK CITY.

*The Teachings of Jesus.* By Harris Franklin Rall. Cloth. 12mo. Pp. 224. Price 75 cents net.

This is a companion volume of "The Life of Jesus," by the same author, which we reviewed in an earlier number of the *QUARTERLY*. Both of them belong to the "Kingdom of God Series, Edited by Henry H. Meyer and David G. Downey." The series, when completed, is to include seven volumes. Each volume contains twenty-six chapters, or "studies." The first two volumes cover "the development of the Kingdom in Old Testament times." The next two present "The Life of Jesus," and "The Teachings of Jesus." According to the announcement there are to be two volumes giving a survey of "the development of the Kingdom since the time of Christ, including a discussion of those social-religious movements of the present day, the support and inspiration for which are to be found primarily in the Christian conception of God and the world." The concluding volume to be published under the title, "The Christian Hope," will present "in constructive form the abiding faith of the Christian fellowship in the final triumph of the Kingdom of God."

We find this volume on the teachings of Jesus even more interesting and suggestive than the previous one on the life of Jesus. The point of view is reverent and devout. The author does not follow closely the traditional teaching of the Church, neither does he affect a radical or destructive attitude towards that teaching. His book is not likely, therefore, to be satisfactory to either the ultra conservatives or the extreme radicals. He evidently tries to approach the teaching of Jesus without prepossessions, and desiring to find out exactly what He said and just

what He meant by it. There will likely be some difference of opinion as to his success in this effort, influenced no doubt by the point of view of the critic. On such points as the deity of Jesus Christ, the sacrificial character of His death, the nature of the Church, the meaning and value of the sacraments, etc., we do not find him as clear and pronounced as we would wish. Others will probably say that he has conceded too much to traditional orthodoxy. But in either case we are sure that the earnest and open-minded student who follows his lead in these studies in the teaching of Jesus will be well repaid for his labor.

JACOB A. CLUTZ.

*Giant Hours with Poet Preachers.* By William L. Stidger. Introduction by Edwin Markham. Cloth. 12mo. Pp. 127. Price \$1.00 net.

In the Introduction Mr. Markham says, "Thinkers are everywhere asking, Is Christianity a failure? I hasten to assure you that Christianity has not failed, for Christianity has nowhere been tried yet, nowhere been tried in a large social sense. \* \* It is for this trial that the watching angels are waiting."

Mr. Stidger has culled suitable extracts from the writings of four American poets—Edwin Markham, Vachel Lindsay, Joaquin Miller and Allan Seeger—and five British—John Oxenham, Alfred Noyes, John Masefield, Robert Service and Rupert Brooke—for the ethical and spiritual messages which they bring. The portraits of the poets and the author's personal comments add greatly to the interest of this little book, which will serve to awaken a desire for a fuller acquaintance with the writings of these ministers of noble ideas.

J. A. SINGMASTER.

*The Significance of the Protestant Reformation.* A Series of Lectures delivered in connection with the observance of the 400th Anniversary of the Posting of the Theses by Luther. By Lynn Harold Hough, Professor of Historical Theology in Garrett Biblical Institute. Cloth. 12mo. Pp. 106. Price 50 cents net.

Four lectures constitute this little volume: The Background of the Reformation, The Religious Aspects of the Reformation, The Political Aspects and Completing the

Reformation. The real Background must be sought in Luther's bold stand for the individual as over against political and ecclesiastical solidarity. The religious problems of the Reformation are, of course, its most important feature. Two fundamental questions were involved—the one pertained to the very nature of religion, the other to the seat of authority. Luther delivered Christianity from the false sacramental theory of religion and reinstated evangelical repentance and the priesthood of believers. The political aspects of the Reformation include the conflict between Church and State and the various economic problems which arose especially between lords and peasants. In the end, religious and political liberty triumph, both true descendants of the Reformation. The completing of the Reformation lies in the fuller realization of the principles of Luther: Access to God, Religious Freedom and Service of our fellowmen. These lectures are a worthy contribution to Reformation literature.

J. A. SINGMASTER.

*The Sources of the Hexateuch.* By Edgar Sheffield Brightman, S.T.B., Ph.D. 8vo. Pp. 395. \$3.00 net.

"The Oxford Hexateuch" of Carpenter and Battersby first gave English readers the text of the first six books of the Old Testament separated into the sources commonly accepted by Higher Criticism, according to the judgment of those painstaking scholars. The text used, however, was the English Revision. That large and expensive work is not available for class-room work in American schools. Moreover, we have adopted the American Standard Edition of the Revised Bible. Some such considerations must have moved Prof. Brightman to prepare this hand-book which gives the text in continuous narrative of the sources J, E and P, "according to the consensus of English, Scotch, Dutch, German, French, Swiss and American scholarship." It is a compendium of results and does not attempt an independent analysis of the text. The Introduction gives a brief outline of the history of Pentateuchal Criticism and its present status. Each source is preceded by a brief description its style and peculiarities. As a handy reference book for the elementary study of the Critical problem of the Pentateuch it should be useful.

HERBERT C. ALLEMAN.

*The Religion of Israel.* By John Bayne Ascham. Cloth. Pp. 238. 75 cents net.

This is the first of six little volumes being issued by the Abingdon Press to be known as the Kingdom of God Series, being studies in the development of the Kingdom of God from the Creation to the Consummation of the Christian hope. The material in the Old Testament is treated by Dr. Ascham, who elects the method of tracing the development of the religious ideas of the Hebrew people in the two branches of Israel and Judah, giving a volume to each. In twenty-six lessons he gives the development of Hebrew religious teaching from the creation of man to the fall of Samaria. These lessons are arranged for adult Bible classes, preparatory schools and advanced groups in week-day religious instruction. The interpretations are those of modern Critical thought. The books are similar to, but hardly the equal of, the series of Kent and his co-laborators.

J. A. SINGMASTER.

BOARD OF CHURCH EXTENSION, METHODIST EPISCOPAL CHURCH, SOUTH. LOUISVILLE KY.

*Alpheus W. Wilson: A Prince of Israel.* By Carlton Danner Harris. 8vo. Pp. xvii, 209.

It is the advantage of the episcopal polity that the able men of the Church find positions commensurate with their talents. Carlyle's thesis "Great men are the fire-pillars of the universe" finds abundant illustration in the development of the Church. Every denomination has its apostles. It is the deliberate judgment of his biographer that "when Alpheus Waters Wilson was given to Methodism the Church received an apostolic Christian, a great administrator, a wise counsellor, and a Pauline preacher." The life of Bishop Wilson, of the M. E. Church, South, falling between the years 1834 and 1916, found him in his early prime at the organization of the Southern branch of Methodism in America. He had passed through the several stages of a lively Christian experience, had humbly found his way into the ministry, had served his apprenticeship on the circuit in the mountains of Virginia, had turned to the law and practiced four years to pay his accumulated debts. With this experience he returned to the active ministry in 1870, and, after serving churches in Baltimore and Washington, he was elected Missionary Secretary in 1878. This was the beginning of a remark-

able career of usefulness. In four years he quadrupled the missionary contributions of his Church. He was elected Bishop in 1882 and served thirty-four years in this capacity. His most conspicuous service was in missionary superintendence. He made six official visits to the Orient and two to Brazil. Above all things else, however, Bishop Wilson was a great preacher, a masterly expounder of Pauline theology. This interesting life-story is told by Dr. Harris in fine literary style and with the enthusiasm of a Timothy for his spiritual father.

HERBERT C. ALLEMAN.

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY PRESS. NEW YORK.

*Aram and Israel, or The Aramaeans in Syria and Mesopotamia.* By Emil G. H. Kraeling, Ph.D. Large 8vo. Pp. xvi, 155. \$1.50 net.

This little book appears as Vol. XIII of the Columbia University Studies. It is a positive contribution to Semitic science. Ten years ago, as a novitiate in Semitics, Dr. Kraeling gave promise of scholarship of a high order; this volume, which introduces him to the reading public, entitles him to a seat among the learned. Up to the present time our use of the large body of sources which have been recovered by excavation in Mesopotamia and Northern Syria has been largely that of the librarian and the epigrapher. A few scholars—Meyer, Hommel and Winckler in particular—have attempted to retrace the course of the Semitic stream; but many tributaries have been discovered since they charted its course, and the work of painstaking revision is in order. The recoveries of such excavators as von Luschan and Pognan, the editorial work of Lidzbarski and Sachau and the identification of many geographical sites throw much light on the ancient Aramaic kingdoms and add many chapters to the history of the Semites which is familiar to us in the Old Testament tradition. These chapters Dr. Kraeling has modestly essayed to write. "From various quarters he has gathered together every scintilla of evidence available," says Prof. Gottheil in his introductory note. The result is a book of prime value to every Old Testament student, especially those who do not command access to the original sources. It is this sort of scholarship which will vindicate the Old Testament narrative more than any *a priori* method of argumentation can possibly do.

HERBERT C. ALLEMAN.



ROGER WILLIAMS PRESS. PHILADELPHIA.

*The Christian Religion in its Doctrinal Expression.* By Edgar Young Mullins, D.D., LL.D., President and Professor of Theology in the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Louisville, Ky. Cloth. Size 6 x 9. Pp. xxiv 514. Price \$2.50.

The volume under consideration is one of great merit. It deserves a place in the front rank of recent theological literature. On the whole it is sound doctrine in a fine literary setting. Its temper is placid and judicial. The learning of the author is excelled only by his modesty.

The point of view is conservative, corresponding with the faith of the Church, without laying much stress on creeds which, however, are received as sources of knowledge. The emphasis is properly laid on Christ as the revelation of God, and then upon Scripture, and finally upon experience wrought in us by the Spirit of God. The doctrines of God as Triune, of man, of sin, and of salvation are Scriptural and are presented in a warm, loving manner.

The method of treatment varies somewhat from that ordinarily pursued. The first third of the volume is devoted to the consideration of preliminary questions concerning theology and religion, in which he lays the foundations for the superstructure. This preliminary survey deals with definitions, postulates of Christianity, the knowledge of God, the Bible and Christian experience.

It is upon Christian experience that the greatest emphasis is placed by the author. All doctrines are viewed in its light, but the author guards his method by disclaiming that experience is the "sole criterion of truth." "He would be a very unwise man who should attempt to deduce all Christian doctrine from his own subjective experience. \* \* Christianity is a historical religion. Jesus Christ is its sole founder and supreme authority as the revealer of God. The Scriptures are our only source of authoritative information about Christ and His earthly career. These are fundamental to any correct understanding of our religion."

The Christo-centric idea which dominates Christian experience leads the author to make the doctrine of Christ first in the discussion. Then follows the doctrine of "the Holy Spirit and the Trinity," after which comes the doctrine of "The God of Our Lord Jesus Christ," His attri-

butes, and works, including providence. From the last the author glides into the doctrine of sin by saying "God's providential government of the world takes account of sin and its consequences." The logical connection does not seem strong. From sin the transition to "The Saving Work of Christ" is natural. Then follow the several chapters on "Salvation and the Last Things."

We are not convinced that the order of treatment is as good as the traditional method which is: God, Man, Christ, the Holy Spirit applying redemption, and the Last Things. We hold firmly to Christ as the center of theology, and hence would approach the doctrine of Christ through the circumference. But the substance is all in Dr. Mullin's treatment.

The discussion of particular doctrines is usually satisfactory. His view of justification is in accord with the Lutheran conception of revelation on this subject, except in so far as the author holds that justification is "never repeated." This latter is a purely gratuitous, dogmatic statement. Just as it is possible to lose faith, so it is possible and even necessary to be justified again, that is, to be forgiven anew.

One of the chief defects of this excellent treatise is any treatment of baptism and the Lord's Supper as means of grace. These ordinances are purely symbolical in their significance and are merely "so-called sacraments." In fact there are apparently no real sacraments in the author's opinion, and hence there is no need to discuss them. He absolutely ignores forms of baptism. The few allusions to the sacraments are slighting. It seems exceedingly strange that so great and generous a theologian should be practically oblivious to the teachings of the Bible and to the age-long experience of the Church in reference to the sacraments.

J. A. SINGMASTER.

AUGUSTIANA BOOK CONCERN. ROCK ISLAND, ILL.

*The Good Shepherd*, with 32 Illustrations. Paper. Pp. 32. Size 6 x 8½. Price 15 cents; per doz. \$1.44 net.

These paper booklets are fine specimens of the printer's art. The stiff paper covers are exquisitely illuminated in gold and colors. The little stories are well told and interesting. Children will be delighted to have these little books.

THE METHODIST BOOK CONCERN. 150 FIFTH AVE., N. Y.

*Side-Stepping Saints.* By George Clarke Peck. 12mo. 329 pages. Cloth. Price \$1.25 net.

No one who glances at this volume even cursorily can doubt for a moment what will be the verdict of a careful reading. From start to finish it is full of life and interest—the best kind of human life and interest. Evidently the author has been a student of human nature as well as of the Bible, and he has the art of combining the results of his study of both and of expressing his conclusions in good racy English. “Breeziness” is the word used by the publishers to describe a striking characteristic of Dr. Peck’s style, and the word is well chosen.

This volume is composed of twenty-four short essays on selected Bible characters, fourteen taken from the Old Testament and ten from the New. Those from the Old Testament are Noah, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Joseph, Moses, Joshua, Samuel, David, Solomon, Elijah, Elisha, Daniel, and Jonah. From the New Testament we have John Baptist, Matthew, Nathaniel, Peter, Andrew, John, Nicodemus, Stephen, Paul and Thomas. It is not easy to tell on just what principle the selection was made, but the several legends used to characterize each man discussed may throw some light on the standpoint from which the author approached his subject. Thus Abraham is called “The Trail Blazer,” Jacob “His Mother’s Favorite,” Moses “The Mountain Man,” Daniel “The Preferred Man,” Peter “The Man of Fire and Frost,” Nicodemus “A Night Visitor,” etc.

The purpose of the author seems to be to bring out in the study of each character the most human points, the points in which he touches elbows with the rest of us and keeps step with us through life. This is probably the meaning of the title of the book, “Side-Stepping Saints.” At least, this is the lesson of the book, sometimes a lesson of warning, oftener a lesson of comfort and encouragement. We too frequently forget in reading the Bible that the men of whom it tells were “of like passions with us,” bearing the same kind of burdens, meeting with like trials and temptations, and reacting to them much the same as we do. Dr. Peck seeks to bring us back to a truer conception of them, and to help us to learn the lessons which their lives and experience hold for us. This is the real use of all biography, and especially of the biographies which we have in the Bible.

The effort at smartness of thought and style, or "breeziness," to accept the word used before, has its temptations. Sometimes it leads to unwarranted statements, as when the author lays emphasis on the fact that the names of the father and mother of Moses are unknown. Has Dr. Peck never read Exodus 6:20-27? There is also an occasional lapse into a flippancy which must be offensive to both a nice literary taste and a fine religious sense. For example, he says of Joshua that he "had no genius for religion, and might have passed God on the street without recognizing him." It is not easy to see why this should have been said of Joshua anyhow, who always appears as a man of stalwart faith and heroic devotion to the service of Jehovah, and one of the very few characters in the Bible of whom we have any extended account of whom nothing is said that is unworthy of a true servant of God.

But these slight blemishes are easily forgiven because of the general excellence of the volume and its rich suggestiveness. We quote the closing paragraph of the essay on "The Trail Blazer, Abraham," just to give a taste of what is in store for the reader on nearly every page. "But I notice another significant thing about this ancient pioneer. It was not in the biographical sketch. But James, reading that sketch, smiled and said, 'Abraham, . . . the friend of God.' Who shall suggest a choicer compliment? I have heard one man referred to as a friend of the President; and another as a friend of Rockefeller, and still another as a friend of John Burroughes. And naturally I felt a secret twinge of jealousy. Perhaps I was half inclined to doff my hat to the friend of the other. But to be a friend of God, and to have God honor the appellation—have you conceived the dignity of that? I have been re-reading Abraham's record in the light of his name. And I think he deserved it. Of course he made mistakes, and some grievous ones. I find it hard to forgive him his denial of Sarah and his treatment of Hagar. But Abraham was not the last man to be made a coward by women. Some men are more afraid of their wives than they are of the police. That is to say, they take more chances with the police. But most of the time Abraham deserved his name, 'friend of God.' See him when a king tried to bribe him. No, you cannot bribe a friend of God. See him when quarrel threatened between him and his brother-in-law. No, it takes two to make a quarrel; and when one of the parties is a friend of God, there will be no quarrel. See him plead for a condemned city, that God will spare it. The friend of God

will always take the part of the condemned. See him on Moriah, ready to give up his own son—as so many fathers and mothers have given up their boys to the trenches. The friend of God balks at no test of friendship. Friend of God; friend of God—O, to be worthy of such description!"

JACOB A. CLUTZ.

*The Psalms and Other Sacred Writings: Their Origin, Content and Significance.* By Frederick Carl Eiselin. 8vo. Pp. 348. \$1.75 net.

Dr. Eiselin, who is Professor of Old Testament Interpretation in Garrett Biblical Institute, has projected a series of four books on Old Testament Introduction for elementary students of the subject. The first volume deals with the Books of the Pentateuch; the second (in preparation) will deal with the books included in the Prophets in the Jewish Canon; the third—the present volume—deals with the writings, according to the Jewish Canon. A fourth volume is to follow on the Text and Canon. The volume before us deals with the Psalms, Proverbs, Job, the Megilloth (The Song of Songs, Ruth Lamentations, Ecclesiastes and Esther), Daniel, Ezra-Nehemiah and Chronicles. An excellent chapter on Hebrew Poetry is prefaced. The author accepts the methods and the average results of the Critical School, but he fairly states the leading arguments *pro* and *con* and he is generally conservative in his findings. The volume is one of results rather than of original investigation, though the author has been a careful student of the Old Testament, knows his ground and not infrequently uses excellent independent judgment. The definitions are very satisfactory, and the volumes of the series will constitute an excellent set of reference books either for the pastor's study or for the college or seminary class-room.

HERBERT C. ALLEMAN.

*The Man of Power; A Series of Studies in Christian Efficiency.* By Lynn Harold Hough. 12mo. Pp. 140. Price 75 cents net.

Professor Hough has a number of volumes to his credit. They are well written. They are full of stimulating thought, stimulating to the highest and best things. The one now under review is a fit companion to the others. There are twelve brief chapters devoted to a study of the

different phases of Christian efficiency. The first one is one of the best. This one undertakes to define what real efficiency is. It is to be found within rather than without. The title of this chapter is "Inner Efficiency." In it the author deplores the tendency to lay emphasis on an efficiency that is simply noisy and fussy, that "purchases sixty minutes of smartness at the expense of an hour of brooding thought." True efficiency is a matter of the spirit. "The very basis of all true efficiency is to be found in the inner life. It must be calmed and steadied and mastered if the outer life is to be one of power. The conquest of the life within is the basis of all other human achievement." This inner conquest and unification of the powers of the soul is attained through a true and deep Christian experience.

Other chapters discuss such topics as "The Efficient Mind," "The Efficient Conscience," "The Efficient Will," "Spiritual Efficiency," "Social Efficiency," "The Efficient Churchman," "The Efficient Citizen," etc.

JACOB A. CLUTZ.

*Bring Him to Me, or the Sufficient Remedy.* By Charles Nelson Page. 12mo. Pp. 72. Price 50 cents net.

The sub-title gives a better idea of the real purpose of this stirring little volume: "A Short Study of Modern Methods in the Redemption of Man." The various methods of social and individual reform on which many depend to-day to make men good are taken up in turn, such as legislation, corrective surgery, improvement of environment, Eugenics and Euthenics, etc., and their insufficiency is pointed out. The only true remedy is to be found in the "Message of the Church," which invites men to come to Jesus. It is only as men are brought to Him and become new creatures in Christ that the evil spirits will be cast out and society truly saved.

JACOB A. CLUTZ.

*The Weekly Rally Service.* By Robert A. Hunt. 12mo. Pp. 42. Price 35 cents net.

One of the most serious and perplexing problems that the average pastor has to meet and solve is the mid-week prayer service. This little book tells how one pastor, a Methodist preacher in St. Louis, solved it in his own church. The prayer-meeting service and the Young People's meeting were combined in such a way as to interest

and attract all classes of people. The plan seems to have been very successful at least in this particular case. The attendance at the service was increased from about a dozen to nearly two hundred.

JACOB A. CLUTZ.

*The Christian College.* 12mo. Pp. 78. Price 50 cents net.

This little volume contains three addresses delivered at the one hundredth anniversary of Allegheny College. The first one is by President Herbert Welch, of the Ohio Wesleyan University. His subject is, "The Ideals and Aims of the Christian College." The second is by Henry Churchill King, President of Oberlin College, on "The Importance of the Christian College as a Factor in the Making of America." The third address, on "The Product of the Christian College in Men and Movements," is by Rev. Thomas Nicholson, Secretary of the Board of Education of the M. E. Church. The addresses are all that might be expected from the character and ability of the men who delivered them. Each presents a strong argument for the worth and support of the Christian College as one of the most important and vital elements in our national system of education. There is also an Introduction by the President of Allegheny College, William H. Crawford.

JACOB A. CLUTZ.

MARSHALL JONES CO. BOSTON, MASS.

*The Mythology of All Races.* In thirteen volumes. Louis Herbert Gray, A.M., Ph.D., Editor. Geo. Foote Moore, D.D., LL.D., Consulting Editor. Volume XII. Egyptian, by W. Max Müller, Ph.D. Indo-Chinese, by Sir James George Scott, K.C.I.E. Cloth, 6½ x 9½. Pp. xvi. 450. Illustrated.

This fifth volume in the series of thirteen is up to the high standard of its predecessors in appearance and contents. Two hundred and thirty-two cuts and plates adorn the volume. The plates illustrating the Indo-Chinese part are very fine, many of them being in colors.

The endless and difficult material of Egyptian mythology has not yet been thoroughly investigated and arranged, but Professor Müller gives in this volume a very thorough and comprehensive sketch of what is known.



He confesses that its complete elaboration would require several volumes of space and a lifetime of preparation. No exhaustive description of the religion of ancient Egypt is possible at present.

The author's investigations lead him to believe, contrary to the findings of other scholars, that "the further back we go, the more primitive are the ideas which we find, with absolutely no trace of monotheism." "The nearer we approach to the original condition of Egypt, the more we find its religion to be an endless and unsympathetic polytheism which betrays an originally animistic basis." "Animism is a very wide-spread form of primitive religion. It has no gods in the sense of the advanced pagan religions; it only believes that earth and heaven are filled by countless spirits, either sedentary or wandering." The author believes that animism best explains the origin and character of primitive Egyptian religion. This, of course, is in line with modern ideas on the evolution of religion, based on historic investigation. To our mind animism is an inadequate explanation of the origin and first form of religion.

From a confused animism arose naturally the personification of the principal cosmic forces like the sun, whose power is so great in Egypt. Then other natural forces in sky and earth and water were invested with divinity. Asiatic myths found their way into Egypt over five thousand years ago enriching its pantheon. The worship of animals is very prominent. The most popular sacred animal was the Apis of Memphis, a black bull, and his successors.

The doctrine of life after death is prominent. Even in the earliest period the soul was believed to be immortal. Great care was taken to preserve the body of the dead, and weapons are placed near it that the dead may protect himself against the evil spirits of the under world. The *Book of the Dead* describes the pleasures of worth in the other world and affirms the annihilation of the wicked. Costly tombs adorned by painters and sculptors, expressed the hope and the affection of the living for the departed. But as soon as the near relatives were gone and these elaborate tombs left without guardians, the latter were rifled, and appropriated by new proprietors for their own burial!

The author concludes his work with the observation that while the Egyptian mythology can in no wise furnish us edification or be compared with the philosophic Greeks and Indians, or with the more systematic Babylonians,

the extremely primitive character of the faith of Egypt makes it a most valuable and indispensable source of information for those who wish to study the origin and growth of religion.

The Indo-Chinese mythology is far more interesting than the Egyptian because more human, more intellectual and more enduring. The latter is dead; the former still has its hold on millions. The mythology of Burma, Siam and Annam is a mixture of Indian, Tibetan, Chinese and native history and superstition—a mixture of hero-worship and distorted history with the worship of intangible natural forces. Perhaps ninety per cent. of the population are or believe themselves to be Buddhists, but really they are so in a very modified form. The great bulk of the Indo-Chinese races have a fondness for totemistic birth-stories and many claim to have sprung from eggs, and from dogs and a few from reptiles and tadpoles. They all believe in the serpent as a symbol of deity. Their serpent, however, usually takes the form of an ornate dragon. Myths of the most fanciful character have been constructed to account for every thing in life. Tombs of elaborate structure, temples and pagodas are the setting of great festivals regularly celebrated.

Mythology is the expression of a blind groping after the things which the human soul longs to find, but which can be found alone through Him, who is the Way, the Truth and the Life.

J. A. SINGMASTER.

